

Also, petition of Mrs. Allan McIntyre, corresponding secretary United States Daughters of 1812, Pasadena, Cal., favoring passage of House joint resolution 230; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of W. G. Fitzgerald, president Chamber of Commerce, Gilroy; C. N. White, business manager San Francisco Advertising Club; C. A. Bernhard, secretary Ukiah Farmers' Club (Inc.), Ukiah; J. H. Whitaker, secretary Board of Trade, Anaheim; Charles H. Roberts, secretary Chamber of Commerce, San Luis Obispo; and Walter G. Schmidt, Western Precipitation Co., Los Angeles, all in the State of California, favoring appropriation of \$300,000 for Yosemite Park, enlargement of Sequoia National Park, and creation of Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Edwin R. Snyder, commissioner State Board of Education, Sacramento; Edward Hyatt, superintendent State of California, office superintendent of public instruction, Sacramento; and L. Woodard, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, Campbell, all in the State of California, favoring passage of Smith-Hughes vocational-education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Paul A. Learned, president Cooks, Waiters, and Waitresses' Union, No. 673, San Bernardino; James A. Francis, president Church Federation of Los Angeles, Los Angeles; Julius Gabriel, Gabriel-Meyerfeld Co., San Francisco; John A. O'Connell, secretary Labor Council, San Francisco; and William C. Eddef, secretary Federated Trades Council, Sacramento, all in the State of California, protesting against House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John W. Mott, Retail Dealers' Credit Association, San Diego, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429—mail-exclusion bills; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, favoring the passage of House bill 20080 and Senate bill 7857; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of James W. Cain, favoring a women's division in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Miss Sallie Mules and Electric Metallurgical Co., favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Nooker Electro Gem Co., favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Titanium Alloy Manufacturing Co., favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of president Niagara Falls Board of Trade, favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the mayor and common council of the city of Astoria, Oreg., urging appropriation by Congress for the purchase of a suitable post-office site and the erection of a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Messrs. F. M. Duff, F. H. Johnson, H. M. Cole, O. T. Patterson, Wesley A. Lowney, and W. S. Miller, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., with reference to the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Pittsburgh Crushed Steel Co. and Wolverine Supply & Manufacturing Co., of Pittsburgh, with reference to excise tax on net incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Hartford, Conn., opposing the passage of mail-exclusion and prohibition bills pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Protest of E. La Montagne's Sons against House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of Man-Suffrage Association of New York against woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of National Temperance Union, of Boston, Mass., favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of sundry citizens of the tenth Minnesota congressional district, favoring increase of rural mail carriers' salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of Baptist Sunday School, 90 people; Woman's Missionary Society, 18 people; Southern Methodist

Episcopal Sunday School, 125 people; Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, 75 people; Tennessee Training and Industrial School; Presbyterian Sunday School, 75 people; Baptist Church, 100 people; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 58 people; Woman's Club, 19 people; First Presbyterian Church, 85 people; Christian Church, 60 people; Christian Church Sunday School, 75 people; Young People's Union, 40 people; Aid Society, Presbyterian Church, 24 people; all of Huntington, Carroll County, Tenn., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 19719, for granting an increase of pension to Wilson J. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petitions of Presbyterian Church, Londonderry; Congregational Sunday School, Hampton; St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, Stafford; 27 voters, Rochester; all of New Hampshire, favoring a constitutional amendment providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of John Devoy Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, Roxbury, Mass., favoring warning American citizens that they take passage or employment on armed ships of belligerent nations at their own risk; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Bismarck (N. Dak.) postal clerks, for increase of pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the North Dakota Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, favoring exclusion of liquor advertising from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 26, 1917.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray that we may fully recognize the sacredness of our citizenship in a land built upon such boundless resources, such Divine ideals, such world-wide principles. Thou hast given to us to write the laws of a Christian Nation. We have not exhausted the treasure house of divine wisdom as Thou hast revealed to us Thy will in Thy word. In the fixing relation of these great principles to our national and social life we pray that we may be guided from day to day by Thy spirit, that the law of our land may be a transcript of the Divine mind. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. Smoot and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Gallinger	Norris	Smoot
Beckham	Hardwick	Overman	Sterling
Borah	Hitchcock	Page	Thomas
Brady	Hollis	Pittman	Townsend
Bryan	Hughes	Polindexter	Vardaman
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Chamberlain	Jones	Robinson	Warren
Cole	Kenyon	Shafroth	Watson
Culberson	Lane	Sheppard	Weeks
Cummings	McCumber	Sherman	Works
Curtis	McLean	Smith, Ga.	
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.	
Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] through illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness, and that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is absent on account of sickness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] on account of illness in his family. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. PITTMAN. I was requested to announce that the following members of the Committee on Indian Affairs are detained in that committee, but if their presence is required for a quorum they will come into the Chamber:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr.

GRONNA], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Sallie Berry Ennes, widow (remarried) of Arthur Berry, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 691);

Elizabeth A. Jennings, daughter of Aaron Bunnell, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 690); and

Edith M. Little, widow of Thomas J. Little, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 689).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the granting of Federal permits or licenses for the sale of liquor as a beverage in prohibition States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Parent-Teachers' Association of the Johnson and Powell Schools, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide adequate appropriation for the support of the extension and development of the public library in the city of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the National Drug Trade Conference at its meeting held at Washington, D. C., January 16, 1917, favoring the adoption of certain changes in section 8 of the Harrison Antinarcotic Act, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of California and Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to exclude liquor advertisements from the mail, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of the Wyoming Wool Growers' Association, praying for an appropriation for the equipment and maintenance of a sheep experiment station in Fremont County, Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the senate of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which I ask may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 8 (by Senator Kimball).

Whereas the people of Kansas have for many years enjoyed the great benefit and satisfaction resulting from the prohibition of the liquor traffic within the State of Kansas and strongly favor both State and National prohibition; and

Whereas the people of Kansas realize the good to humanity and to the people of the United States that will result from the adoption of national prohibition: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring therein). That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to fulfill its duty to the Nation by submitting to the people thereof at the earliest possible date an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and importation of alcoholic beverages in the United States, and to in the meantime enact such additional legislation as may be necessary to aid and assist the States having prohibitory laws to better enforce them; and be it further

Resolved. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States and to the Members of the United States Congress and Senate from the State of Kansas.

Mr. WATSON presented a petition of Black Creek Local Union, United Mine Workers of America, of Linton, Ind., praying for the placing of an embargo on food products, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Thomas J. Clark Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying that the good offices of the United States be employed in the recognition of the independence of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of the congregation of the Free Baptist Church of Waterbury Center, Vt., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of the Nonpartisan League of Newburg, N. Dak., remonstrating against any change

in second-class postal rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Nonpartisan League of Newburg, N. Dak., remonstrating against large appropriations being made for the Military and Naval Establishments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Nonpartisan League of Newburg, N. Dak., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of Texas, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 4 (by Mr. Bailey).

Whereas the decision of the United States Supreme Court in what is known as the Shreveport rate case gives the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to strike down a State-made rate, notwithstanding the fact that the State rate may be just and reasonable within itself; and

Whereas, if such is to remain the law, the right of a sovereign State to regulate its lines of railway transportation will be seriously crippled if not destroyed; and

Whereas the platform of the Republican Party, recently adopted at Chicago, contains a plank which boldly declares for the abolition of State railroad commissions: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Legislature of Texas, voicing the sentiment of the people of this State, is irrevocably in favor of the doctrine of the right of a State to regulate purely State commerce, and that we now here declare our steadfast opposition to any further encroachment by the Federal Government upon the rights of this State to regulate purely State commerce, and that our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from Texas are earnestly requested to support and vote for any and every measure that has for its object the abridgment of the right of the Interstate Commerce Commission to further encroach upon the rights of a State, and for its further object the perpetuation of the right of a State to regulate purely State commerce and to fix and establish freight rates charged by railroad companies operative entirely within this State.

Resolved further. That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Indorsed: January 18, 1917.

Read and adopted.

JOHN D. MCCALL,
Secretary of the Senate.

In the house, January 18, 1917.

Received from the senate.

Read and adopted.

BOB BARKER,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have introduced a bill intended to cure the situation referred to in that resolution. The bill is pending before the Interstate Commerce Committee. A hearing was held on the bill at my request during the last session of Congress. So far, the committee has not taken any action on the bill. At the hearing representatives of the National Association of State Railroad Commissioners, members of State railroad commissions, including Hon. Earl Mayfield, railroad commissioner of Texas, and secretaries of several chambers of commerce of Texas cities, appeared and spoke. The city of Shreveport and the State of Louisiana were represented in opposition to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. CATRON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7601) for the relief of Caleb T. Holland, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 984) thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7433) for the relief of Winfield S. Solomon, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 982) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7598) for the relief of John H. Kidd, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 983) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 8034) granting an increase of pension to John C. Daley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 8035) to amend section 4 of the act of September 6, 1916, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, to fix the time when the annual terms of the Supreme Court shall commence, and, further, to define the jurisdiction of that court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 8036) to allow a pension of \$30 per month to Edward Marvin Carter, of Savannah, Ga., for loss of eye at military camp, Macon, Ga., on July 13, 1916, while serving in the United States Army; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 8037) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Davis;

A bill (S. 8038) granting an increase of pension to George R. Ashley;

A bill (S. 8039) granting an increase of pension to Susan Soehner; and

A bill (S. 8040) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Fraley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 8041) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McCoy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 8042) granting a pension to Mrs. Thomas Kelly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 8043) granting a pension to Ellen H. Russell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1917; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment providing that drop or local letters shall pay postage at the rate of 1 cent per ounce or a fraction thereof, including delivery at letter-carrying offices and on rural routes, intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19410), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the maintenance and education of children of lighthouse keepers for a period of three months in each year where there are no school facilities, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 to be expended under the direction of the Department of the Interior and the supervision of the National Park Service for constructive and conservation work in the newly created Sieur de Monts National Monument or Park, located on Mount Desert Island off the coast of Maine, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the public-buildings bill (H. R. 18994), which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES.

Mr. THOMAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 7066) to provide for the investigation of controversies affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS.

Mr. JONES. I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 330), as follows:

Resolved, That the Vice President be authorized and directed to appoint a committee of five Senators to consider what clerical help should be allowed Senators and Senate committees. Such committee is authorized to sit while the Senate is in session or in recess, and is instructed to consider and report to the Senate on or before December 15, 1917, what clerical assistance should be allowed Senators to do their individual official work and what help should be allowed the different Senate committees to do committee work, and the compensation which, in its judgment, should be paid such help, with a view to securing economy, efficiency, and fair treatment in the performance of the business of the Senate and the official work of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if there is any expense attached to the resolution?

Mr. JONES. There is not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on January 25, 1917, approved and signed the following acts:

S. 5718. An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona; and

S. 1093. An act to permit the Denison Coal Co. to relinquish certain lands embraced in its Choctaw and Chickasaw coal lease and to include within said lease other lands within the segregated coal area.

THE INAUGURATION.

Mr. OVERMAN. I introduce a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States on March 5, 1917, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, March 5, 1917, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police for three days, at \$3 per day, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, the same to be immediately available; payment to be made upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said joint committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator a question or two before giving consent for the consideration of the joint resolution.

I notice that there has been introduced a joint resolution referring to the protection of life and property of citizens during the inaugural. I did not hear it read; in fact, it was not read. I do not know whether this joint resolution refers to the protection of life or of property, but I wish to suggest to the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that in a great many cities in this country on great occasions steps have been taken to prevent the public from being robbed.

The Senator is as well aware as I am that these inaugurals have been made the occasions to grossly rob the American people. It was not very long ago that I had a constituent wire me—I will not say it was for the inaugural—to get a room at a certain hotel. I phoned down to the hotel and I found that he could get that room for \$200. Rates something similar to that have been the rates that have been charged the American people by hotels in the city of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator if it is his intention or the purpose of his committee to allow another inaugural to pass without some protection of the American people who are invited to come to Washington?

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the joint resolution which I have introduced is to protect the Capitol Grounds, to erect stands, and to illuminate the Capitol, and as far as the grounds are concerned to the pay of policemen and officers to protect the public here. Of course, the joint resolution has nothing to do with the city outside of the Capitol Grounds. What the Senator refers to relates to the city and that is in charge of the city.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know, but, Mr. President, in a joint resolution or bill of this kind there could be well inserted an amendment that would take care of the visitors to the Capitol and protect them against exorbitant charges.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is right about that and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has just introduced a joint resolution which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations to aid the District in keeping order. I suggest that that would be the place for the amendment, because that is under the supervision, I understand, of the police department of the city. This joint resolution is simply for the Capitol and Capitol Grounds, to erect stands.

Mr. McCUMBER. As all the principal committees are in charge of Members of the Senate on the other side of the Chamber I hope the appropriate committee will take this matter up and do something to protect the people who are invited to come to Washington to view the inaugural.

Mr. OVERMAN. I fully agree with the Senator, and if the Senator will suggest to the Committee on Appropriations what he thinks would be necessary to put that suggestion into law I would be glad to consider it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a simple little law that shall provide a penalty to be imposed upon any hotel keeper who shall make a greater charge for the use of his rooms during the inaugural than is his usual charge, or if they think that is not enough they can double it and treble it, and yet you would save the people millions of dollars.

Mr. BORAH. The law might be simple in its terms, but it would be very difficult to pass it, I should suppose.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it is a very difficult thing to handle, but it will have to be handled on another joint resolution that will come up hereafter.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why does the Senator from Idaho say it would be difficult to pass it?

Mr. BORAH. I am not quite ready for the Government of the United States to enter into the business of fixing hotel rates, at least I should want to reflect upon the matter.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am quite ready for the Government of the United States to enter into the business of protecting its citizens from robbery wherever that robbery may occur.

Mr. BORAH. Well, we can pass a law if we want against robbery and arson or anything of that kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. Or extortion, and this is extortion.

Mr. BORAH. But it can hardly be extortion in the ordinary when a man voluntarily goes into a hotel and registers. Whatever is done will have to be done by cooperation between the citizens and the hotel keepers here in Washington, but not without considerable opposition would I consent to passing a law of the Government of the United States establishing hotel rates. I do not want to see the Government assume the burden of establishing hotel rates. That would give rise to a few hundred more Government employees.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think we can prohibit extortionate charges by the proprietors of hotels as well as by other people. The Senator might say that he would not support a measure that would fix a reasonable rate of interest to be charged, but we do fix such rates, and we provide a penalty for extortionate interest charges.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. I have watched, Mr. President, with great interest all that is being done here in the city of Washington to get a big crowd to attend the inaugural ceremonies. The people here get the use of the public streets and public buildings and secure aid to get visitors to come here from all over the country. That is well and good, but I have not noticed any efforts being made in the local press, by the local associations, or by any of the people of Washington to prevent the people of the United States from being robbed and plundered when they come here to attend the inauguration. I therefore suggest that before we afford them all of these accommodations and facilities we require from them something in the shape of protection for the American people who come here.

Mr. President, I have been here during several presidential inaugurations, and I have noticed the same thing to which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] refers—how the people are brought in here and how they are robbed by the proprietors of hotels and restaurants. It will be time enough for us to give the people here all these advantages and facilities when they show a disposition to properly regulate the rates to be charged here, and to prevent the visitors who come here to attend the inaugural ceremonies from being plundered and robbed.

Mr. OVERMAN. A discussion of that matter would be proper on a resolution pertaining to that subject; but this resolution only refers to the inaugural ceremonies. The Inaugural Committee has nothing whatever to do with the regulation of the city or the establishment of police regulations outside of the Capitol Grounds. This resolution is to enable the committee appointed by the Senate to arrange for the proper ceremonies at the Capitol. That is all it proposes to accomplish. There will probably be a resolution reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia to assist in keeping order in the city, but as to this resolution the Inaugural Committee has nothing whatever to do, except what is to be done right here at the Capitol.

Mr. WARREN. The Appropriations Committee is simply to appropriate the money to carry the laws into effect, and the matter to which the Senator from Minnesota refers will rest with some other committee. A resolution of that kind, it seems to me, should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary or

to some committee which might properly take jurisdiction of the subject.

Mr. OVERMAN. That matter can be discussed later, when a proper resolution is before the Senate. The passage of this resolution will merely enable your committee to erect stands and to provide for the ceremonies in the Senate and at the front of the Capitol. Our committee have no jurisdiction whatever over the city.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the present consideration of this resolution, but I want to enter my protest against any such expenditure of the public moneys as that for which it provides. The inaugural ceremonies in Washington are largely, almost entirely, a commercial enterprise, to which the Government should not make itself a party. I should like to see one President of the United States inaugurated with appropriate and dignified ceremonies suitable to a democracy. We are having in this country a coronation every four years. It is undemocratic; it is un-American; and I should like to see it abolished.

There is no reason why such ceremonies as these should be conducted upon the inauguration of the President of the United States, but there is every reason, to my mind, why it should not be done. I am not willing to make myself a party to any such proceedings as are going on now in the District of Columbia by which there will be spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to inaugurate the President of the United States. I should like to see the President himself declare against that sort of thing and protest against his inauguration being made the means of any such ceremony.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the contemplated ceremonies will be very simple, and a resolution providing for similar ceremonies is passed by Congress every four years. No matter what the President or anybody else says, there will be at least 100,000 people here on the Capitol Grounds. Would not the Senator from California comfortably provide for them, so far as he could, seating capacity?

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, these 100,000 people are inveigled into coming to Washington through the instrumentality of the people of the District of Columbia, who are advertising this as a great show.

Mr. OVERMAN. This resolution has nothing to do with the ceremonies in the District of Columbia outside of the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. WORKS. It has a good deal to do with it. We are contributing our funds for the purpose of helping carry out this entire proceeding.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. WORKS. There is no occasion for the Government of the United States to expend \$25,000 or any like sum for the purpose of providing a place for the mere inauguration of the President. It is absurd on the face of it, and I should like to see the Senate raise its voice against that sort of misappropriation of public funds and the violation, as I think, of the very principles of the Government under which we are living.

As I said in the beginning, I am not going to object to the present consideration of the resolution, because I know very well it will be adopted. We are doing what we have been doing for a good many years; this, of course, is not the first occasion on which it has been done; but I had hoped that the President, who has done something toward preventing the expenditure of moneys in this way in the past, would go a little further than he has already done, and would enter his protest—which would be entirely sufficient—against this great show that is going to be carried on in the District of Columbia, merely because he is to be inaugurated President of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall not oppose the consideration of the resolution, although I largely sympathize with the views which have just been expressed by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS]. I am gratified that the amount embodied in the resolution is not larger than it is. I am astonished, to paraphrase a familiar expression, at our own moderation under the circumstances. I am also in hearty sympathy with the suggestions made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I do not know that we can directly reach the evil to which he refers. It is not confined to Washington, but is characteristic of caterers wherever there is an unusual gathering of American citizens. The old Spanish buccaneer, who rode the Spanish Main, flew the black flag, and took his life in his hands when he attacked his prey, must, if there is such a thing as a future life, turn over in his grave whenever he thinks of his modern successor, disguised as the proprietor of a hotel or at the head of some institution furnishing the necessities of life, because of the impunity with

which they carry on his old business sheltered under the forms of law.

I have observed, Mr. President, in this District that the people are largely a unit in their support of everything designed to get money out of the Federal Treasury when it is to be expended here. The amount which will be expended by the visitors to the inaugural ceremonies, unless something can be done to prevent it, will, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has suggested, probably be expressed by a million of dollars in the aggregate, and the greater portion of it will be extortion, pure and simple.

Some of us are trying to prevent an increase of appropriations by this Congress. In so doing we are obliged to resist an organized movement to increase the salaries of all employees. Instead of our receiving some little encouragement in the District, every newspaper and every organization is behind the movement, and some of them are ungenerous enough to criticize those of us who believe that this is not the time or the occasion for such increases. A morning paper in its issue of yesterday morning went so far as to assert that this proposed increase was an act of justice to an unorganized body of employees, when we know that they are not only organized, and thoroughly organized, but that they are affiliated with the greatest labor organization in the world and that they are carrying on an organized propaganda in the Capitol. As I have said, instead of receiving sympathetic support from the people of the District, or any part of them, in our efforts to economize, the entire trend of public sentiment and public effort is in favor of these increases. Of course the reason is obvious; the money is to be expended here, and the object of the business community of the District is to secure these added appropriations, because the great body of employees will merely be a conduit through which they will pass on the way to their own coffers.

Now, Mr. President, there should be some way of economizing so as to offset the consequences of this propaganda and in some degree make reparation for the extortions that are sure to be practiced upon the people of the United States who come to this inaugural. For instance, we can adopt a different system of taxation for the District.

Mr. President, I have been an advocate of what is called the half-and-half system. I have believed, all things considered, that it was fair both to the people and to the Government, and therefore I have voted against efforts to abolish it since I have been here; but I am about to pass the Rubicon. If the people of the District will manifest no disposition to assist those of us here who are trying to economize, if they band together on occasions like the inauguration to extort money from visitors—and they will do it—then let us require them to pay all the taxes essential for the support of the District Government; and if this propaganda of increases becomes successful, as it bids fair to be, then I must give notice that hereafter wherever it is possible to economize in the District I shall make the effort and join those committed to the abolition of the half-and-half system.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has suggested that the proposition of which I spoke could be considered in connection with another joint resolution which has been introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. The joint resolution which the Senator from Maryland has introduced reads, in part, as follows:

Said commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure such preservation of public order and protection of life and property and fixing fares by public conveyance—

I think that we could leave the matter to which I have referred to the commissioners, and if we would add after the words "public conveyance" the words "hotels and restaurants," I think it would cover the matter.

I see no reason why we should throw the protecting arm of the Government around the citizen to save him from an extortion of \$5 by a public conveyance and leave him unprotected when it comes to a hotel charging him \$200 for a \$5 room. I can see no great difference in principle unless it should be applied with a stronger arm where the extortion is the greater.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, do I understand this joint resolution is now before the Senate?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; the one from which I have read has merely been introduced for reference to the appropriate committee.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the matter now, but I shall do so when the proper time comes.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. WORKS. I desire to ask the Senator from North Dakota how many people he thinks would come here to be robbed if the President were inaugurated in a quiet and dignified way, as I think the President of the United States should be inaugurated?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think, Mr. President, there would be very few of them; and I desire to say now that I agree with the views of the Senator in every respect in reference to the inaugural ceremonies.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am just as much opposed to ostentatious display as are the Senators who have spoken, but no one will come here to the inauguration who has not some money to spend. People understand before they come here the conditions which will prevail, for these things have been going on for years and years, and they understand perfectly well that they are coming here to have a good time, to share in the occasion, in its display, and in its good time with the people of the District of Columbia, and they know before they come that they will have to share their money with the people of the District of Columbia. That is what it takes to make a "good time"; and so long as we have inaugurations conducted in this way thousands and thousands of people are coming, and I have not seen any petition or other request coming from those people asking us to protect them after they get here. Before they come they understand precisely the conditions, and they are perfectly capable of taking care of themselves.

Mr. WORKS. Does not the Senator think that people who come here under those circumstances deserve to be robbed?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has said, people will come here, but they will have to pay their bills, and I hope that the information furnished the Senate this morning will be given wide publicity, so that a certain number of my constituents will not have to borrow money from me with which to get home. [Laughter.] I have a considerable sum invested in that way that I never expect to see again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment, offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], begins on page 62. It proposes to strike out all after line 18 down to and including the last line on page 65, striking out the Subtreasuries at Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the question of striking out the provision for the Subtreasuries, as provided in the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, was considered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations; and the action of the committee was determined, I think, on a statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury. There were no detail reasons submitted by the Secretary why the Subtreasuries should not be abolished, but he did state to the committee, through the chairman of the committee and over the telephone, that he thought it would be very unwise to strike out the appropriations providing for the Subtreasuries.

The committee then prepared an amendment to the bill, as found on page 31, referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] yesterday, which reads as follows:

The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate the work performed by the Subtreasuries and report to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session what part of the work of the Subtreasuries may be transferred to other offices of the Government or banks of the Federal Reserve System, and for the purpose of this investigation the representatives of the Bureau of Efficiency shall have access to all necessary books and other records of the Government.

After a discussion of this amendment, Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States decides to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, the Senate then can reconsider the amendment offered by the committee and disagree to it.

Mr. President, in the speech made yesterday by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] in opposition to the amendment I notice this statement:

What are these Federal reserve banks? We talk of them here in the Senate sometimes as though they were Government banks, owned, controlled, and managed by the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the Federal reserve banks are private institutions, the stock of which is owned by the various national banks and the few State banks and trust companies that have joined the Federal Reserve System. The majority of the board of directors of every one of these Federal reserve banks is elected by the member banks, and every officer save one within the banks is appointed by the officers who are elected by the member banks. The proposition, therefore, is to turn over certain functions, powers, and duties of the Government to private institutions that are owned and controlled by the banks of the country. When we propose to enter into that sort of thing it would be well for us to pause and reflect and make certain that we are not committing a great error.

I think it is proper to call attention to the law and see whether the Federal reserve banks are privately owned banks and whether the Government of the United States has no control over them.

The Federal reserve act, in section 15, provides that the Federal reserve banks—

When required by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall act as fiscal agents of the United States.

The act further, in section 11, authorizes the Federal Reserve Board—

To exercise general supervision over said Federal reserve banks.

Again—

To suspend or remove any officer or director of any Federal reserve bank.

Again—

To suspend for the violation of any of the provisions of this act the operations of any Federal reserve bank, to take possession thereof, administer the same during the period of suspension, and, when deemed advisable, to liquidate or reorganize such bank.

In view of these provisions there seems to be no more danger that a Federal reserve bank might refuse to perform the duties required of it by the Secretary of the Treasury as fiscal agent of the United States under the Federal reserve act than there is fear that the Secretary of the Treasury himself might neglect to perform the duties required of him by law. If any reserve bank should violate the law, it would be the duty of the Federal Reserve Board to remove its officers and assume charge of the bank. If the board failed to do this, it would be the duty of the President to remove the members of the board and appoint persons who would perform their duty.

However, there is no conceivable incentive for any Federal reserve bank to lay itself open to the penalties provided for refusal to comply with the law. The banks would redeem gold and silver certificates out of moneys deposited with them by the Secretary of the Treasury. They would normally use these deposits as directed by the depositor, just as they would use any other deposit. It would, of course, be incumbent on the Secretary of the Treasury to keep in every reserve bank a sufficient amount of gold deposited to redeem all certificates presented by the bank. If, however, he should fail to do so the reserve bank could still receive gold and silver certificates presented for redemption and issue certificates of deposit therefor. These certificates of deposit could then be exchanged for gold and silver dollars at the nearest mint at the New York Assay Office or at the Treasury here at Washington.

At present a very large percentage of the redemptions at the Subtreasuries are made in this manner and doubtless the majority of the large redemptions made through the Federal reserve banks would be effected in the same way. Even if it were conceivable that a Federal reserve bank should expose itself to the penalties of disobeying the law, such action would have no more serious effect than to inconvenience the person presenting gold certificates for redemption. If the Subtreasuries should be discontinued, the Treasurer should continue to redeem gold and silver certificates at Washington, and he should retain in the Treasury, the mints, and the assay offices the entire amount of gold and silver dollars that is necessary to redeem the outstanding gold and silver certificates. The Federal reserve banks should be required to make redemptions out of the general fund deposits placed with them, or else by means of order on the assay office at New York, the mints, or the Treasury at Washington. Ordinarily the certificates redeemed would be reissued if fit for circulation and replaced by new ones if unfit for circulation. If, however, a Federal reserve bank should need an addition to its supply of metallic gold, such gold would have to be shipped from the nearest mint or assay office, either as additional deposit or in exchange for certificates returned to Washington.

Mr. President, even if every dollar had to be transported by express and the cost of transportation paid by the Government, it would be a small amount compared to the expense of main-

taining the Subtreasuries that now exist. I will frankly state that I thought at first it was not wise to abolish these Subtreasuries; but after going into the details and finding out just the workings of the Subtreasuries, I am convinced that they ought to be abolished and that no harm will come to the business of the country if they are abolished at the present time.

In the discussion upon this subject four questions have arisen, and there seems to be some misunderstanding about them. I want to discuss briefly the workings of the department and of the Subtreasuries as affecting these questions that have arisen in this debate.

The first is that the Secretary of the Treasury is not authorized to deposit in the Federal reserve banks the gold and the silver dollars held for the redemption of gold and silver certificates and United States notes; that is, the so-called trust fund.

This is true; but only a small part, 12.5 per cent, of the gold held to redeem gold certificates and United States notes is kept in the Subtreasuries. Out of a total of two billion and ninety-three millions of dollars in gold held by the Treasury Office, according to the reports received December 14, 1916, there is one billion seven hundred and forty millions in the mints and assay offices of the country. Of this one billion seven hundred and forty millions of dollars, about four hundred and fifty millions is in the Denver Mint, three hundred and fifty-seven millions in the San Francisco Mint, three hundred and twenty-five millions in the Philadelphia Mint, and six hundred and seven millions in the New York Assay Office. The remainder of all the gold held by the Government, amounting to only three hundred and fifty-three millions of dollars, is in the Treasury and Subtreasuries. Of this \$353,000,000, more than \$100,000,000 is in the general fund and can legally be deposited in Federal reserve banks. Four millions of dollars is in the Treasury at Washington. The balance of the gold trust fund in the Subtreasuries is, therefore, only about \$250,000,000, out of a total of two billion and ninety-three millions of dollars.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. WORKS. May I ask the Senator how many of these Subtreasuries are in the same cities that have reserve banks?

Mr. SMOOT. All of them with the exception of one, and that is at Baltimore. No; there may be two.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken about that. Why, there are half a dozen.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken. I do not think Baltimore is the only one.

Mr. POMERENE. No, Mr. President; the city of Cincinnati has a Subtreasury and the Federal reserve bank of that district is located at Cleveland. There is no branch in Cincinnati.

Mr. OVERMAN. There are half a dozen of them; so the Senator is altogether wrong.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, I will name where they are, and then we will see.

One of the Subtreasuries is located at Baltimore, and, as I stated, there is no Federal reserve bank in Baltimore. Even if there is no Federal reserve bank there, Mr. President, there is no question but that the business of Baltimore can be taken care of just as well from Washington or the nearest Federal reserve bank as at present.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I want to say—

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can in a few moments speak in his own time. Before I get through I will give my reasons for my statement. Then the Senator can criticize my reasons, if he so desires.

The next is at Chicago, one at Cincinnati, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco. Those are the places where the Subtreasuries are located.

Mr. POMERENE. The matter the Senator is discussing now is covered by the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury himself, and, if I may read just three lines, the Secretary says:

Federal reserve banks are located in the Subtreasury cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and San Francisco. New Orleans has a branch of the Federal reserve bank of Atlanta, while neither Baltimore nor Cincinnati has a Federal reserve bank.

Neither has a branch.

Mr. SMOOT. I forgot Cincinnati. I did mention Baltimore, but I really had forgotten Cincinnati.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. There are two cities that have neither mints nor assay offices nor Federal reserve banks. Those are Baltimore and Cincinnati.

Mr. SMOOT. Those are the only two.

Mr. NELSON. Those are the only possible exceptions where anything can be urged in favor of retaining the Subtreasury.

Mr. SMOOT. The committee first agreed to strike out Baltimore from the bill, thinking that the Subtreasury there was unnecessary; but after a reconsideration, as I stated in my opening remarks, Baltimore was put back into the bill.

Mr. President, I desire to continue. A statement of the Federal reserve banks shows that they held on December 8, 1916, \$427,000,000 in gold certificates; that is, they owned more of the gold in the Government custody than is kept in the Subtreasury. They could therefore, without authority of law, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, take over all the gold in all the Subtreasuries by simply presenting the gold certificates which they hold. These figures make it apparent that the Subtreasuries are not needed for the custody of the gold trust funds.

Of the silver dollars held by the Treasury officers, about \$156,000,000 is now in the Treasury at Washington, \$190,000,000 in the mints, and \$148,000,000 in the Subtreasuries. Of this \$148,000,000, about \$18,000,000 is in the general fund and can be deposited in Federal reserve banks.

The balance of the silver trust fund held in Subtreasuries is therefore about \$130,000,000. This amount could not be deposited in the reserve banks, but would have to be transferred to the custody of superintendents of the mints or assay offices or else shipped to Washington. That is all the trouble there would be. There is no question but that the Treasury of the United States could order it to-morrow to be done, even if the Subtreasuries continue.

The other statement made, or one of the others, was that it is necessary to keep large amounts of metallic gold at the port of New York, and perhaps at other ports, in order to settle our trade balances in gold. In the New York Subtreasury there is about \$113,000,000 in gold coin and no gold bullion. The assay office at New York has \$807,000,000 in gold bullion. Foreign balances are commonly settled in bullion, not in coin. This bullion comes not from the Subtreasury but from the assay office in the form of certificate bars.

Mr. OVERMAN. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a statement that was made by Mr. Brown on a request for the facts as to where the gold of the Government was located and just what the Subtreasuries, the mints, and assay offices of the country hold.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. Brown wants to have the Subtreasuries abolished.

Mr. SMOOT. He does not make any recommendation.

Mr. President, foreign balances are commonly settled in bullion, not in coin. The purchasers of these bars—that is, gold bars—deposit their money in the Subtreasury and receive a certificate of deposit, which they present to the assay office as an order for the bars. The Federal reserve bank could with equal facility receive the purchase money and issue the certificate of deposit, which would be paid by the assay office. Therefore, while a Government office able to handle large amounts of gold is needed in New York to receive and furnish gold for the settlement of foreign balances, the Subtreasury is not needed for that purpose, as the assay office supplies the need.

The other statement was that the abolishment of the Subtreasuries would not save any money, because all the expense of more clerk hire, space, and transportation of currency that is now borne by the Government would have to be borne by the banks if the Subtreasuries were discontinued. In support of this contention it was stated that the transfer of the disbursing officers' accounts from the Subtreasuries to Washington in 1913, although proposed as a measure of economy, did not actually save any money.

The facts are, Mr. President, that the Federal reserve banks would undoubtedly have to assume the responsibility of transporting a large amount of currency to and from Washington if the Subtreasuries were discontinued. The estimate for 1918 for this purpose and other purposes amounts to \$150,000.

To offset this expense the Federal reserve banks would necessarily receive, if the Subtreasuries were abolished to-day, gold deposits amounting to at least \$70,000,000. These deposits would be interest free, as are the \$30,000,000 of Government deposits the Federal reserve banks already hold. Interest on the total deposits of \$100,000,000 at 2 per cent would exceed by about \$1,400,000 a year the total amount of the clerical expense and transportation charges that the banks would incur by taking over the Subtreasuries' work.

The transfer of this business to Federal reserve banks would therefore not merely relieve the Government of a large amount of expense but would also provide the Federal reserve banks with increased opportunities for profits. There would be no

offsetting loss to the United States, for the money in the Subtreasuries now earns no interest.

It should be noted also that the transfer of the disbursing officers' accounts to Washington in 1913 did not result in a saving of more than \$50,000 a year, as is shown by a reduction in the estimates of the Treasurer's office as well as for the Subtreasuries.

The other statement was that the Federal reserve banks in some cities do not have adequate quarters, and particularly do they lack the vault space necessary to take over the Subtreasury business. If the Federal reserve banks had no other quarters with adequate vault facilities, there seems to be no reason why they should not be allowed for a moderate rental to use the quarters now occupied by the Subtreasuries. Such a plan would be convenient to the bank and profitable to the Government.

Mr. President, there is no question but that if the Subtreasuries are abolished the Government will save millions of dollars, and there is no question but that if the gold is deposited in the Federal reserve banks, and if they secure 2 per cent upon the amount of the deposit, there will be over a million dollars to the credit of these banks annually.

If we want to save in this bill money for the Government, and do no harm whatever to the business interests of the country, we can abolish the Subtreasuries now and allow the Federal reserve banks to do the business. They can do it now under the law as it exists, the very law that created them, as I have called attention to, section 15 and section 11 of the act itself.

Mr. President, I thought perhaps it would be better to make an investigation, as the committee thought, but after finding out just where the Government gold is deposited, how it is transferred from the credit of one Subtreasury to the other, I have become convinced there is no question but that it would be a proper thing to abolish all the Subtreasuries and allow the business to be done by the Federal reserve banks.

I therefore hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be adopted.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I notice about five Democrats in their seats on this side of the Chamber. They ought to know what we are doing so as to be able to vote intelligently. Therefore, before beginning the few remarks I want to make, and it will be only a few, I feel compelled to suggest the absence of a quorum. I want to say that all during the consideration of this bill a number of the friends on this side have not been here. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARREN in the chair). The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Gronna	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Hollis	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Husting	Oliver	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Sterling
Clapp	Jones	Page	Sutherland
Clark	Kenyon	Phelan	Thomas
Culbertson	Kern	Pittman	Townsend
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Poincxter	Vardaman
Curtis	Lippitt	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lodge	Robinson	Warren
Fall	McCumber	Shafroth	Watson
Fletcher	McLean	Sheppard	Works
Gallinger	Martine	Sherman	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] are absent engaged on important business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the proposed abolishment of the Subtreasuries. The head of the great fiscal department of our Government is the Secretary of the Treasury. Who knows most about whether the Subtreasuries ought to be abolished or not; the man who administers the fiscal concerns of the Government, or a Senator who has investigated this matter in a cursory manner here while the appropriation bill is before us?

It is contended that to abolish these Subtreasuries would save a great deal of money; that it would save \$300,000. That is impossible. If the Subtreasuries are abolished, the Secretary of the Treasury reports that all of the business which is now done

by the Subtreasuries would have to be done somewhere. Therefore you will have to provide for the clerks that are now in the Subtreasuries if you abolish them. Instead of doing this and for the convenience of the people of the country at Boston, Cincinnati, and the other Subtreasury cities all the work will have to be done in Washington. The Secretary of the Treasury will be required to have a number of clerks to do the work that is being done now in these great cities. Therefore you might save the place of the superintendent of the Subtreasury, but the work which is done by all the other officers who perform the service that is done in the Subtreasuries will have to be done here in Washington, at a great inconvenience to the citizens of the country who have business with the Treasury Department.

Mr. President, the committee had this question before them for consideration. It has been time and again contended that the Subtreasuries ought to be abolished, and the committee think that is a question which ought to be investigated. We brought this matter to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury in order that we might have a report from him, and he has reported that it would be suicidal now to abolish these Subtreasuries. Your committee thinking that probably, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has stated, the Subtreasuries in time should be abolished have provided in the pending bill that a report on that subject be made to the next Congress with a view to their abolishment. Ought we now at once to abolish the Subtreasuries when we have a report from the Secretary of the Treasury to the effect that the reserve system, which it is proposed to substitute for them, has only been in operation a little over a year and a half or two years? We shall probably abolish them in the future; they will be abolished, but they should not be abolished now, especially, I repeat, when we have made no provision in the pending bill for clerks in the Treasury Department to do the work which is now being done in the Subtreasuries in the great cities. Your committee thoroughly investigated the matter so far as we could, and we came to the conclusion that, instead of abolishing the Subtreasuries, we had better direct the Efficiency Board to go thoroughly into the matter and to report to us at the next session of Congress.

Mr. President, we could not abolish the Subtreasuries at this time. If this body should attempt to do it, or should adopt this amendment, it would not be sustained. There has been a fight in the House of Representatives on this subject. The committee in the other House did report to abolish the Subtreasury at Baltimore, and there is less necessity there for a Subtreasury than there is anywhere else. I will say with all deference to the Senator from Maryland, but on the floor of the House they reversed what the committee had done, because, as the House of Representatives think, and as our committee think, and as other Senators think, this is not the time to abolish the Subtreasuries.

Mr. President, I do not propose to read from the record, though a great many Senators have not heard this debate, but I am relying on what the Secretary of the Treasury says. I am going to read a few lines of his testimony, he being the head of this great service for the Treasury Department, being the man to whom we look, whose duty it is to report to us, and can we not rely on what he says about this matter?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to call the attention of the able acting chairman of the committee to the fact that I have understood, and I so reported to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], that in support of the position taken by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Secretary of the Treasury and the members of the Federal Reserve Board say that if these Subtreasuries are abolished they not only will continue to require, as the Senator from North Carolina has said, the same amount of force, but they will have also to be located at the same places; that they will have to send them to the people and not bring the people here, and that in the end we should neither save money nor force, nor would such action make for convenience.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Illinois has brought out that point. Not only has the Secretary of the Treasury reported against the abolishment of the Subtreasuries now, but the Federal Reserve Board, which knows more about this matter than does any Senator upon this floor, has also done so.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] stood with the committee here at first, but now he is upon the floor fighting their action, because, forsooth, he has received a little report from Mr. Brown, who has not investigated the matter thoroughly,

as he should have done. I am surprised at the Senator from Utah. When this subject was before the committee we provided for a plan by which we could investigate it with a view to the abolishment of the Subtreasuries, but the Senator now comes in and advocates this amendment, when we had formerly voted that plan down in committee, and had even voted to restore the Baltimore Subtreasury. I am surprised at the Senator from Utah coming in here and doing that after we had considered the matter in committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OVERMAN. I always gladly yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, inasmuch as we have put a provision into the bill directing the Efficiency Board to investigate this matter and to report to Congress, does the Senator from North Carolina think it was a very proper thing for the head of that Efficiency Board to interfere in any way with the subject?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not. That is what I am referring to here and to the Senator from Utah now coming here with a report from Mr. Brown before Mr. Brown has been ordered to make this investigation. Does that indicate that Mr. Brown has prejudged the case?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether or not the Senator from North Carolina was in the Chamber when I made my opening statement, but from the remarks which he has just made I should judge he was not. If the Senator was present, however, I will say that what he says is uncalled for. I told the Senate plainly that I had agreed in committee to allow this provision to go into the bill, and I called attention to the provision on page 31 of the bill authorizing an investigation to be made by the Efficiency Bureau. I then stated why I had changed my mind on the subject.

I do not want any Senator to cast reflections upon Mr. Brown. As I stated in my opening remarks, I asked Mr. Brown to inform me where the gold which had been deposited with the Treasury of the United States had been placed; whether it was in the mint, whether in the assay offices, or whether it was in the Treasury here in Washington, and the amount that was in the Subtreasuries. Mr. Brown merely furnished me that information. He has made no report. I have not said that Mr. Brown has made a report upon this matter after a thorough investigation. He simply states exactly where the gold is and how the transfers have been made, as I have previously stated.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am not reflecting on Mr. Brown. I think he is a very efficient officer. I desire to say that he has heretofore had duties placed upon him by provisions incorporated by the committee on appropriation bills, and I want to know why he has been investigating this matter without any authority? The only authority he has is that which we now propose to confer upon him. That he has been using his time in investigating this subject when he had no authority to do so seems to me apparent from the fact that the Senator from Utah comes here and reads a long statement which has been prepared for him by Mr. Brown, which occupied a half hour or an hour in its reading.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if anyone is to blame in the matter, it is not Mr. Brown. On the basis of statements made here, I asked for certain information of Mr. Brown, if he could obtain it for me. Mr. Brown prepared the figures which I have presented, and I believe they are perfectly correct. If there is anything wrong with the statement which I have made, then, of course, the statement should be criticized; but do not criticize Mr. Brown because of that fact, for I believe the figures are absolutely correct.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the committee had, and the Senator from Utah, as a member of it had, a report from the Secretary of the Treasury; we had also a report submitted by Mr. Warburg, of the Federal Reserve Board; and, instead of relying on the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Federal Reserve Board, the Senator from Utah goes back on his committee, stands up in the Senate, and uses a statement made by a man who had no authority to make an investigation. He did, however, make it, and the Senator reads that statement upon the floor here as against the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and as against the desires of the Federal Reserve Board—12 good men, who are trying to do their duty and to inform Congress as to what it ought to do or not to do. The law has placed upon these officials the respon-

sibility of reporting to this Congress what we should do and what we should not do in regard to such matters.

The Senator from Utah does not rely upon the Secretary of the Treasury or upon the Federal Reserve Board, but he comes here relying upon an ex parte statement made by a Government official. It is of that I complain. I am not criticizing Mr. Brown, for he is a good and faithful officer; he has done great work, and I hope he will do greater work when we confer authority upon him to investigate this matter. I have no doubt he will then give us the right kind of a report. When, however, has he had time to investigate this subject? The matter we have given him to investigate was not along these lines at all. Hereafter, if this bill passes, Mr. Brown will investigate the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. Brown has not made an investigation. I had not the time to do so or I could have gathered the facts myself which Mr. Brown secured for me. Not having the time, I asked him to do it for me.

So far as my action is concerned in approving an amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] which is not in conformity with the action of the committee, I desire to say that I do not believe that I am bound by any action of any committee. I do not believe that I have to rely on whatever the Secretary of the Treasury says; and until to-day I have never heard of any report having been made by the Federal Reserve Board on the subject.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator was present and heard the debate on yesterday, and so I infer he heard the statement as to what Mr. Warburg had stated.

Mr. SMOOT. All I know is that it was not before the committee. I have not heard of a report until to-day, and it was never mentioned in the committee what the attitude of the Federal Reserve Board was. I desire to say now that whether or not this amendment carries—and I doubt whether it will carry—the Subtreasuries will be abolished, and I want to have particular notice taken of what I say on this day, that the Subtreasuries will be abolished. Why? Because they are a useless expense to the Government of the United States, and because the Federal reserve banks can do the same work and do it with less expense.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am of the opinion that the Subtreasuries will be abolished. As a member of the committee, I have been trying to do my duty, and I have not had time to investigate this matter as fully perhaps as has the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], but I want to say that, being a member of the committee, I would rather rely upon the sworn estimates sent to the committee than to go out and get an estimate from some man who is not informed on the subject, and who has not been given the authority to investigate. I will state further that this report was before the committee, and the Senator from Utah saw it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. OVERMAN. I gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator has seen fit to extoll the Secretary of the Treasury, and he has just admitted that he thought this system ought to be abolished.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; I said that in time it would be abolished. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. NELSON. That "in time it would be abolished," but he wants an investigation. I desire to say to the Senator that if the Secretary of the Treasury had done his duty he would have come before Congress with a scheme for abolishing this system and would have made recommendations to Congress accordingly; but he did not do that because it involved too many Democratic officeholders.

Mr. OVERMAN. Ah, Mr. President, my friend is bringing partisanship into this matter. My distinguished old friend from Minnesota, one of the best friends I have in the Chamber, now and then shows that he has a little yellow streak of Republicanism in him that will make itself manifest on occasions. This is no Democratic matter or Republican matter; it is a business matter. The Federal Reserve Board have reported that this is not the time to abolish the Subtreasuries.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I say to the able Senator from North Carolina that there are 11 officers in the Subtreasuries who have been appointed by the Democratic admin-

istration, but there are 153 others connected with the Subtreasuries appointed by preceding Republican administrations, who will likewise suffer if the mere question of politics is to be considered, being wholly Republican.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no doubt that two-thirds of the employees of these Subtreasuries are Republicans, as is the case in every other department of the Government, but that does not make any difference to me. I consider this a pure matter of business, and I ask Senators to throw aside politics and let us look at this question from a business standpoint. The Federal Reserve System has only been in existence a short time, and is probably not now prepared to take over this work. When the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board say that the Subtreasuries ought not to be abolished at this time, not as Republicans or as Democrats, but as business men—when that opinion is given to us by the head of the department having supervision of all these matters—what are we going to do about it? Shall we vote according to our political sentiments, even if we destroy what has been considered heretofore a splendid system inaugurated for the benefit and convenience of the people who live away from Washington and who have business to transact with the Treasury? Shall we so vote as to make them come to Washington to transact their business?

Mr. President, let us see what the Secretary of the Treasury says on this subject. I want to read just a few words from his letter:

I am of the opinion that it would be inadvisable at this time to abolish all, or any, of the Subtreasuries.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, from whom is the Senator quoting?

Mr. OVERMAN. From the Secretary of the Treasury. He continues:

It is an important matter, and should be considered deliberately.

We have not now time to consider this matter deliberately, as we should do, and that is the reason why the committee asks for a board to investigate it.

The Secretary continues:

With the test of further experience it may develop that the functions of the Subtreasuries, or some of them, may be transferred to Washington, or to some other agency, but action should not be taken hastily or inadvisably.

In another part of his letter the Secretary of the Treasury says:

Aside from New York, the cost of maintaining the other eight Subtreasuries is \$347,416.88.

As the Senator from Minnesota has stated—

Which is a comparatively small sum to pay for the service and convenience they provide. If these institutions were abolished, the total cost of operating them would not be saved, as a counter expenditure by the office of the Treasurer in Washington, resulting from the increased work that would be thrown upon that office, would be entailed.

Now, the Senator from Utah and other Senators want to abolish these Subtreasuries without providing a system in the Treasury to take their place.

Mr. NELSON. Let me ask the Senator a question, Mr. President. What does the argument which he has just read amount to? The statement of the Secretary of the Treasury amounts to this, that these institutions ought to be continued perpetually.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. NELSON. He does not recommend anything; he does not intimate that there ought to be a change. If he had done his duty, he would have looked into this matter and recommended the proper legislation for the abolition of the Subtreasuries.

Mr. OVERMAN. Well, Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury does say that it may be advisable to abolish them at some time in the future; but here comes the Senator again criticizing the Secretary of the Treasury, whose sworn duty it is to make these reports. I do not care what the Senator from Minnesota or any other Senator may say, the present Secretary of the Treasury, as almost everyone admits, has made a great Secretary of the Treasury, and has done a tremendous amount of work for the good of the people. He is trying to serve the people as best he can; and when we impose upon him the duty of telling us what should be done, and he performs that duty, the Senator from Minnesota rises, showing his politics and partisanship again, and criticizes the man who has been directed by law to send his report here. I am surprised that my very good friend should stand up here and criticize the Secretary of the Treasury simply because, in response to the law, he sends to Congress a letter in which he says that just at this time it would be very inadvisable to abolish the Subtreasuries.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to read one further extract, and then I shall take my seat.

Mr. OLIVER. Very well.

Mr. OVERMAN. I quote further from the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury:

It has been suggested that the Subtreasuries are merely conveniences and not necessities, and that their duties might be performed entirely by the Treasury in Washington.

That is what Senators have said. Let us see:

This is in a sense true, but the cost of handling all the business from a common center, in a country so extensive as the United States, might be greater than the expense of the Subtreasury system.

Think of handling the business of the people of San Francisco here in Washington, when now it is handled in their own city through the Subtreasury there! Why should not the people of Philadelphia transact their business in that city, with the Subtreasury there, instead of coming here to Washington to transact it?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senator from Utah does not say that the business of the Subtreasuries should or would be transacted at Washington. The Senator from Utah claims that the Federal reserve banks have the authority under the law to do nearly all of this work, and therefore there would not be very much more work in Washington if the Federal reserve banks should take over the business of the Subtreasuries and administer it, as I believe they will.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator does believe that, but the men who are best informed about it do not believe so; the men under whose administration this matter comes do not agree with the Senator from Utah. I know the Senator from Utah is very wise, but sometimes he is about as wrong as others are, and in this case he has gone off halfcocked in making an effort in the Senate to-day to defeat the committee. That is what he has done. It shows that he went off halfcocked when last night he obtained a report from a man here in Washington, when all the time he had before him the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, saying:

Whereas the delays and inconveniences which the public would have to suffer might prove a very serious handicap upon business.

The Secretary of the Treasury expresses that as his opinion; the Federal Reserve Board concurs in that view; and I know that when the Senator investigates the matter thoroughly he will agree with them. That is the reason why I want to advise him hereafter not to take a position upon a mere ex parte statement. I do not blame him for fighting the committee if he desires to do so; he has a right to do that, and he has a right to change his mind; but I do criticize him for securing a paper and reading it this morning embodying a report from a man who was not authorized to make any investigation and putting that forward as against the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Reserve Board. That is what I criticize.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not care anything about the criticism, but I do want to say that if the report of the Secretary of the Treasury is right and it is going to be an inconvenience to the business interests of the United States to abolish the Subtreasuries, then they never ought to be abolished; it would be wrong to abolish them, and the mere expense that there is attached to maintaining the Subtreasuries should not be considered if their abolition is going to interfere with the business of the United States; and I want to say to the Senator that he ought to change his mind and I ought to change my mind, and the Subtreasuries never ought to be abolished.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; all the Secretary of the Treasury says is that at this time they ought not to be abolished, but he intimates that a system can be worked out by which they can be abolished. He says:

It could with equal force be argued that internal-revenue offices throughout the United States could be abolished and all of the work done at Washington, and, in like manner, that many of the customs offices throughout the country could be abolished and all of the work done from Washington.

Why, Mr. President, all these things have been established for the benefit of the business men of this country, instead of requiring one central establishment here. This is a great, big country, and these conveniences ought to be furnished to the people.

I repeat that I think in time these Subtreasuries will be abolished; but let us not abolish them until we provide the necessary clerks to transact the business that is now being transacted by the Subtreasuries.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I confess that I have not had the time to make the personal investigation I should like to have made on this subject. I have relied largely upon the statements made by the Secretary of the Treasury and what I understand to be the position of the Federal Reserve Board.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] a moment ago referred to the city of Cincinnati and the Subtreasury in that city, and I address myself rather to the conditions there than to the situation generally throughout the country.

I am satisfied, from the information I have, that it would be a very great mistake for the Congress of the United States to discontinue the Subtreasury in Cincinnati. I think it will offend the entire business public in that section of the country. I know that the business people of that city are almost a unit in opposition to the attempt to abolish the Subtreasury. They have felt for a long time that they ought to have a branch of the Federal reserve bank, if not the Federal reserve bank itself, in that city. This position may be in part due to local pride; but there is a very large commercial business conducted from that city, and the Subtreasury there is serving a very large section of the country. I do not think I can place the situation before the Senate better than to read a paragraph or two from a letter I have received from Mr. Arthur Espy, the subtreasurer. He says, under date of November 17:

The functions of the Treasuries, particularly that of redemption and exchange, do not seem to me to be such that it would be wise for any private or semiprivate institution to be permitted to discharge them.

Then, referring to the local conditions, he says:

My office is located in the center of the large territory that it serves, and the business of the office has grown very much since I have been assistant treasurer.

I think he has been assistant treasurer for perhaps two years.

For instance, yesterday I made more than 50 shipments of coin in the territory bounded by the Lakes, Tuscaloosa, Ala., the eastern part of West Virginia, and Terre Haute, Ind. I can not see how any substitute system could be devised that would accomplish these services at so small a cost as the Subtreasuries can accomplish them. Appropriations for my office are only \$24,830 for salaries, and about \$1,000 for contingent expenses. The functions of the Subtreasuries can not be made profitable; and if the Federal reserve banks should assume them, they would certainly have to be paid a larger sum than it now costs to maintain the Subtreasuries. It is well to have the Government's gold widely distributed and in its exclusive charge. I have more than twenty millions of gold in my vaults, against which, of course, there have been issued gold certificates which are in circulation, and to order gold certificates under the act of 1900. My business amounts to nearly \$1,000,000 per day.

If the Subtreasury at Cincinnati is to be abolished, then, in my judgment, there must be some other arrangement made to accommodate the business of that section. Possibly it could be done by a branch bank, but that branch bank has not been organized. It has not yet been demonstrated that this branch bank could be conducted with more satisfaction or with less expense to the Government than the Subtreasury. I think that the Senate has done wisely by adopting the provision they have in the bill directing the Efficiency Bureau to investigate this subject and make a report. I have so much confidence in the Secretary of the Treasury, and in the Federal reserve banks, and in Mr. Brown, whom the Senator from Utah quotes, that I believe that if they have an opportunity to investigate this matter they can come before the Congress of the United States with some concrete suggestions which will perhaps be to the benefit of the country financially as well as to the business world, and for this reason I am very clearly of the opinion that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota ought not to prevail.

I realize that we sometimes like to inject a little politics into subjects of this character, and perhaps both sides of the Chamber are chargeable with that fault; but if it be pure politics, I think only one Democrat in the Subtreasury at Cincinnati would be displaced. I know the vast majority of the others, and I think all of them are Republicans. They are protected by the civil service. There has been no attempt by the Democrats to remove them; but if there had been a change of administration I think Senators on both sides will agree that there would have been an attempt to remove the subtreasurer.

Mr. REED. But not to abolish the Subtreasury.

Mr. POMERENE. But not to abolish the Subtreasury.

Of course, I do not think conditions have very materially changed in the last generation. All of these places were regarded as important and necessary to the public business during the Republican administrations. It may be that they have offended against business policy by retaining them; but if they have so offended for so many years, they ought not to object to a retention of this system for another year, until we shall have had a full opportunity to investigate and get full knowledge on the subject.

Mr. OLIVER and Mr. PHELAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). The Chair begs pardon. Did the Senator from California address the Chair prior to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from California first addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania realize that such is the case? The Chair does not wish to seem—

Mr. OLIVER. I addressed the Chair first, and I do realize that; but I am perfectly willing to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. If that is the Senator's understanding, I shall be pleased to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLIVER. I am perfectly willing to listen to the Senator from California, and I hope he will be allowed to take the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is now recognized.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that in San Francisco, Cal., there is a Subtreasury, I desire to bring such information as I have to the attention of the Senate, just as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] described the conditions in Cincinnati.

If the Subtreasuries were abolished, I do not know that it would be possible to transfer their functions to the Federal reserve bank, because the Federal reserve bank as I know it in California has not at the present time the facilities for doing the work of the Subtreasury. I will not advert to the fact that the Federal reserve banks are, like the national banks, private corporations, and therefore that they should not be wholly intrusted with the custody of the great reserves in coin and currency which belong to the United States; but I do know that the Federal reserve bank has no facilities whatever for the storage of coin. The Subtreasuries in all parts of the country have large storage facilities, vaults which give security; and within the last year and a half there has been erected in San Francisco a monumental Subtreasury building, costing for land and structure probably \$500,000, and equipped with the best possible storage facilities. I do not know whether or not in this debate the question of storage has been raised, and yet it is one of the most important phases of this question.

I read but the day before yesterday that so large an accumulation of gold and silver had been piled up in the assay office and Subtreasury at New York that permission had been asked of the Government to transfer the major portion of it to the Philadelphia Mint for mere purposes of storage. Now, the Federal reserve banks not having facilities for storage, it would be utterly impossible, if this amendment prevailed—the amendment proposing the abolition of the Subtreasuries—for them to handle and hold the funds of the United States.

The Senator from North Carolina calls my attention to the table. In New York there is accumulated \$320,000,000. In San Francisco I know there is approximately \$100,000,000 in storage. The transactions there approximate \$300,000,000; and, in passing, I may say that this enormous volume of business has been handled for \$25,000. If the transfer were made in the interest of economy, I do not believe it would be possible for the Federal reserve banks to take care of this business of the Government at any such comparatively insignificant cost, for the reason that the Government would have to make arrangements with the Federal reserve banks in the first instance as to taking over this enormous business, and I do not believe that bankers would undertake that enormous responsibility at any such cost, because we all know that private banks pay very much more for the services of their assistants and their employees than does the Government.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PHELAN. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator inform us as to what it would probably cost the Government to furnish adequate storage facilities if this Subtreasury system were done away with and this gold were to be turned over to the Federal reserve banks?

Mr. PHELAN. I am not in possession of that information; but it stands to reason that it would cost the Government—or more properly cost the banks who are conducting that business for their stockholders for profit—a sum so large that they would have to make a very considerable charge to the Government for increasing their facilities. In the second place, it is a matter of time. It could not possibly be done, should this motion prevail, before there would be a need to make the transfer.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PHELAN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. There is only a certain amount of the gold in the United States Treasury that could be deposited in the banks, as suggested by the Senator, amounting to about \$70,000,000. Now, does the Senator know that there is \$1,740,000,000 of gold at the present time deposited in the mints and assay offices—not in the Subtreasuries, but in the mints and assay offices? You have in the San Francisco Mint, not in the Subtreasury, \$357,000,000. So all that the reserve banks would be called upon to do would be to receive \$70,000,000; and I do not know of a bank in all the world that does not want to receive deposits. The Federal reserve banks will not be permitted to receive the money that is in assay offices or in mints. That is not intended. That would not be the case if the Subtreasuries were abolished. But the Federal reserve banks could receive the \$70,000,000 in the general fund, and that could be used just the same as any other deposits.

Mr. PHELAN. I will say in answer to the Senator that these mints, wherever they may be located—there is a mint in Philadelphia, in Denver, and in San Francisco—could doubtless be used for storage purposes; but there is a question there of divided responsibility. Should the Federal reserve banks receive \$70,000,000, they would in that event have to provide increased storage facilities, let us grant; and in the second place they would have to obligate themselves to hold that money in storage. It is not true that by depositing this money, this coin, silver and gold, in the Federal reserve banks it will get into circulation—a thing highly desirable in most instances—but this money is held as a trust fund for the payment of gold and silver certificates and of greenbacks, and hence it is not desirable for the Federal reserve banks as such either to seek or to acquire it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know the Senator from California wants to be absolutely correct. The gold that is in the mints and the assay offices is held to redeem the gold certificates, just as the Senator says; but I was speaking of gold in the general fund. It is not held for the redemption of gold certificates. It will be deposited just the same as the Senator himself deposits money. It would be in circulation just the same as the deposits of the Senator go into circulation. I admit that the gold that is in the mints and the assay offices—the \$1,740,000,000—is held for the redemption of gold certificates, and the silver that is held is held for the redemption of the silver certificates; and I called attention in my remarks to where the silver bullion was located.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] calls my attention to a comment of the Secretary of the Treasury on the subject, which I will read before I quote the subtreasurer at San Francisco on the same subject. The Secretary of the Treasury says:

The gold coin and bullion held against gold certificates, amounting at present to more than \$2,000,000,000, a considerable part of which is deposited in the Subtreasuries, should not, in my opinion, be committed to the custody of any private corporations (and the Federal reserve banks are private corporations), but should be in the physical control of the Government itself. This applies with equal force to the \$152,979,025 of gold reserve held against United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890 and the silver dollars held against silver certificates.

The subtreasurer at San Francisco, who, by the way, is a very competent subtreasurer, and who is the only Democrat, if I may refer to partisan politics, which has been raised here, in the Subtreasury, so far as I am advised, because the entire staff is under the civil service, has prepared a statement with his full and intimate knowledge of his own Subtreasury, in which he says—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend until the Chair announces that, the hour of 1 o'clock having arrived the unfinished business must be laid before the Senate? It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is temporarily recognized for the purpose for which he rises.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No objection being heard by the Chair, it is so granted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the consideration of House bill 18542.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now lays before the Senate House bill 18542, and upon the request of the Senator from Utah for unanimous consent, there being no objection, it is so granted and the bill is before the Senate. The Senator from California is now recognized.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, in the statement of the sub-treasurer at San Francisco he says:

In addition to the foregoing duties and functions of the Subtreasuries, they have the custody of a large part of the reserve and trust funds, consisting of gold coin and bullion and silver dollars deposited to secure gold and silver certificates and greenbacks; much vault space is required for the deposit of these trust funds, especially the silver dollars; the new San Francisco Subtreasury Building, which has only been completed a year and a half, cost approximately a half million of dollars, and its vaults, among the largest and best in the country, cost \$130,000; besides the large amount of gold coin stored in these vaults, they contain over \$25,000,000 in silver dollars, nearly all of which are held as trust funds against outstanding silver certificates.

He goes on:

A large portion of the money in the Subtreasuries are trust funds which really do not belong to the Government and can not be used by the Government because they are held as security for the payment of gold and silver certificates and greenbacks; hence it is a fallacy to argue that this money should be put in circulation through the medium of the Federal reserve banks. Any agency that holds this trust fund must hold it as a trust fund, or, in other words, must hold it in storage.

I make the point that, inasmuch as we have not got in all parts of the country storage facilities connected with Federal reserve banks, it will be impracticable at this time to make the transfer.

I am not arguing against the abolition of Subtreasuries. Possibly there will be a way found when we receive the report of the Bureau of Efficiency, when the Secretary of the Treasury, under a resolution adopted last year by the House, makes his final report on the means by which a transfer can be made and the necessary provision made for storage and for the additional assistance; but at this time, if we put the money accumulated in such vast quantities in the hands of Federal reserve banks, there will not be sufficient facility, in the first place, nor would there be sufficient expert help, unless we took over the staff of the Subtreasuries, and there would not be fixed and bonded responsibility.

My recollection is that the subtreasurer at San Francisco receives \$4,500 a year, but out of that he pays \$500 to an insurance indemnity company for the enormous bond which is required of him; and instead of that office being one desirable for deserving or other Democrats, it is an office which seeks the man. Very few have the combined ability and responsibility to assume duties of that kind. In this instance I know that in seeking a man for that position who would be worthy of it there was very considerable difficulty encountered.

So there is nothing before us now but a mere business question, which is certainly not a political question, and I am sure we are united in the desire to accomplish for the Government the very best results.

It stands practically uncontradicted that the Federal reserve banks are not at this time capable of assuming the work of the Subtreasuries. In the second place, there is no demand from any part of the country that such a transfer be made, except the general demand, which is incessant all the time, to conduct the Government on business principles and with economy. There can be no economy now in making this transfer, possibly no economy at any time. It will only tend to a greater centralization if the money, as has been suggested, be transferred to Washington. The very purpose of the Federal Reserve System was to decentralize, to give to the different sections of the country facilities for doing their business without coming with hat in hand to Wall Street or with hat in hand to Washington.

On the Pacific coast we have a great territory which is served by our institutions, notably by the Subtreasury there. We have the Panama Canal, and the merchants have been accustomed, under authority of the Treasury Department, to deposit the tolls in the Subtreasury at San Francisco for the payment of their vessels passing through that waterway. That is an enormous advantage to the shipping of that port. Our port of San Francisco is a great commercial port. For transactions in the Orient it is necessary to ship gold to it and to ship gold in the course of business of full weight. The Subtreasury has served that purpose by giving full-weight gold in exchange for worn or abraded or depreciated currency or coin. We are in receipt constantly of great shipments of coin and metal from Australia.

So I think if on a fair consideration of this matter it were determined to abolish any Subtreasury, it would be necessary, on account of the peculiar character of the business of the port of San Francisco and the distance from the central Government,

to maintain it there as an arm of the Treasury. The Treasury has provided for itself, as I told the Senate, a monumental building, a matter of pride to the Federal Government and the people, and in that building has installed great vaults for the storing of the coin and bullion.

I am merely making my contribution to this discussion as one having knowledge of that particular Subtreasury. I am willing, however, when the time comes and when we are advised by the Treasury Department and by the Efficiency Bureau, probably at the next session, to seek a consolidation, if such a thing were practicable, in order that there may be a decrease of cost and an increase of efficiency. But unless that can be proven, which I am disposed to doubt, so far as San Francisco is concerned, it would be futile for this body to take up a matter which would lead nowhere. There is no complaint whatever as to the administration of the Treasury Department; there is no political question involved; there is no petition either from the head of the Treasury Department or from the Federal reserve bank to make the transfer at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. To the contrary, they protest against it.

Mr. PHELAN. To the contrary, the Senator from Maryland reminds me, both the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have asked the National Legislature not at this time to interfere, and I submit it would be an interference with the orderly conduct of their great department to make a violent change at this time.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I have no doubt from the information which has come to me and from what I have gathered during this discussion that eventually these Subtreasuries will have to go, and in some way or other the duties now performed by them, with the possible exception of San Francisco, where the Subtreasury might be maintained on account of its great distance from the center, will be merged with the duties of the Federal reserve banks. I think this is all the more probable from the fact that in some places at least the regional Federal reserve banks maintain very expensive quarters and have a very expensive organization with very little to do, and it would be somewhat of a charity to give them additional reasons for existence by consolidating them with the Subtreasuries in the immediate neighborhood.

A Subtreasury is not necessary to the existence of a place. There is no Subtreasury in the great city of Pittsburgh, where I live, and still that city and that district conduct a banking and monetary business far exceeding that of Baltimore or Cincinnati or San Francisco. On account of the great size of the pay rolls handed out week by week in that section the demand for coin and for currency is greater there than it is in almost any other city in the country.

But, Mr. President, I think that before we tear down this old system we ought to have something in view with regard to building up the new, and as there is nothing proposed except the mere abolition of these Subtreasuries now the duty would be cast upon the Treasury Department to legislate to a certain extent with regard to the method of transferring their duties.

The Bureau of Efficiency is at work upon this very question, and inasmuch as they are now in existence and going along doing the work, and doing the work at a very reasonable cost, I think Congress ought to be rather slow about abolishing them and should give the Bureau of Efficiency a chance to recommend a system upon which the substitution can be made.

I therefore am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and will vote for the continuance of these institutions for the present at least.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I think it probably entirely unnecessary that I should have anything to say upon this subject after listening to the lucid explanation of the Senators who have preceded me, who have shown most conclusively the fact that it is unwise at this time to abolish the Subtreasuries of the United States; but inasmuch as the city of Baltimore was involved in the doing away with the Subtreasury of that city I feel that I want to say a few words in regard to Baltimore City.

This matter was brought up in the House and the Subtreasury of Baltimore City was abolished by the House committee without any knowledge whatever on the part of the representatives of Baltimore City. After learning that such had been the case a committee came from Baltimore in order that they might be heard. I attended that meeting. I attended the hearings with the gentlemen who went before the committee of the House and it was proven most conclusively to that committee that they had done wrong in abolishing the Subtreasury at Baltimore, and, as we are all aware, it was put back.

Now, the argument used here is that they are seeking to abolish the Subtreasuries in order to save money. So far as

the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and so far as recommendations and the report of the reserve banks are concerned, I have come to the conclusion that there will be very little money saved.

Mr. President, aside from saving money it seems to me the convenience of the people of the United States should be considered to some extent. So far as Baltimore City is concerned, we felt that we were entitled to a reserve bank in Baltimore City. We were unfortunate and it was not given to us.

Owing to our inability to secure a reserve bank we are obliged to fall back upon the Subtreasury in order to conduct the business of Baltimore. There is over \$200,000,000 worth of business done through the Subtreasury. In the statement by the bankers and business men of Baltimore before the committee, men in whom I have the utmost confidence and who would not make a misstatement, it was stated that if the Subtreasury was abolished in Baltimore City the expense to the business people and bankers of Baltimore City would amount to over \$200,000.

Now, it does seem to me that we should not take this action in view of the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and the Federal Reserve Board have protested against the abolishment of these Subtreasuries, in view of the fact that they have stated that there would be very little saving if they were abolished, in view of the fact that the convenience to the people of the United States would be very greatly interfered with. I will state to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, for whom I have the highest regard, when he says that it is a political matter, that so far as Baltimore is concerned, I think that every man in the Subtreasury is a Republican but one. Therefore no such purpose as that can be accomplished. I think he was mistaken entirely in his statement. I think from what the Senator from Illinois stated that such is not the case with a majority of the employees.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator I am very sorry I injected that matter into the debate. It came from the fact that I thought the Senator from North Carolina took an unusual and undue and untenable course in the matter. He rather provoked me into saying what I ought not to have said. Senators who have served with me here for many years know that in matters of legislation I have as a rule never been actuated by a partisan spirit.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not believe—

Mr. NELSON. I want to say further, if he will permit me—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is all right.

Mr. NELSON. I think myself that under present circumstances an exception should be made in respect to Baltimore and Cincinnati. It was my original purpose to offer the amendment in that form, but I thought perhaps that could be adjusted in conference. But I take it that the other side of the Chamber will be unanimous in voting down this proposition, so that it will not go to conference. If it could possibly pass and the matter go to conference, I should be very glad if an exception was made for the time being in favor of Baltimore and Cincinnati. I realize how both cities feel; that they feel they were slighted and discriminated against by the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota there is no man in this body for whom I have a higher regard, and I am sure he would not have any political reason for the abolishment of the Subtreasury if he thought it was an improper thing to do, and I recognize that was not his intention.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me a word further, when I first took up this matter and made my first remarks on the subject and afterwards until I was somewhat provoked by the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina the thought of politics never entered into my head. I never had the least idea of looking at it from that standpoint.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Now, Mr. President, in regard to this matter it does seem to me that a matter of so great importance, that affects so many people throughout the country, that brings about so much convenience to so many citizens, it would be a most improper thing to take this action without due consideration and in the face of the protests of the Secretary of the Treasury, in face of the protests of the Federal Reserve Board, in face of the fact that there will be very little money saved, in face of the fact that there is in the bill to-day an efficiency commission provided for that has been authorized to investigate this matter and see whereby it if shall be abolished the ma-

chinery shall be instituted to replace the work that is being done now by the Subtreasuries.

I do hope that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota will not prevail.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, there are seven Democrats on the floor and but six of the minority party. I do not think we ought to legislate with so small a number on the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Johnson, Me.	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Jones	Overman	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Kenyon	Page	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Kern	Phelan	Smoot
Chamberlain	Lane	Pittman	Thomas
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lewis	Ransdell	Walsh
Gallinger	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Warren
Gronna	McLean	Shafroth	Watson
Husting	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Weeks
James	Nelson	Sherman	Works

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. FERNALD, Mr. STERLING, Mr. LODGE, Mr. FALL, Mr. CLAPP, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CUMMINS, and Mr. BANKHEAD answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am not in the habit of basing my action in opposing or favoring legislation which has to do with public matters which are located in Massachusetts, on the fact that they are located there. Although I think there is a great deal of sound reason and sense in the statement which has been made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] relating to the Subtreasuries, I am convinced that Senators do not understand all the details of the work which is done by the Subtreasuries, and I am confident that there must be legislation passed which will enable the Federal reserve banks in cities where Subtreasuries are located to take over the functions which are now performed by the Subtreasuries. I have no doubt that an investigation, when it is made, will show that very many of the activities of the Subtreasury may be dispensed with, if they may not be entirely abolished. I hope such an investigation will be made, if this motion does not prevail; but it does seem to me that we ought to know more about the question than is contained in the information which has been thus far furnished to the Senate. Therefore I am opposed to action being taken at this time. Next winter I shall take a different position if the testimony which will be presented at that time convinces me that the Subtreasuries are no longer necessary.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has very generously conceded that it was a mistake to consider this matter from a partisan standpoint. In view of that concession, I should like to call his attention and the attention of others here to-day to another general, broad consideration that applies to this proposition to abolish the Subtreasuries throughout the country.

Mr. President, the Subtreasuries are the direct fiscal agents of the United States Treasury throughout the land. Looking at the matter broadly, I can not help thinking that it is in the interest of the country to have these agents for this financial distribution, themselves holding Government cash, throughout the country in addition to the Federal reserve banks, because these agencies are direct agencies, subject to the direct policy of the Treasury Department. There is no board of directors, there are no stockholders with any kind of financial interest or policy that can intervene or affect or retard the action of the Subtreasury performing its functions under the orders of the Treasurer of the United States. Therefore, looking at this matter broadly, instead of abolishing these Subtreasuries I think every one of them should be preserved, and where necessary transferred to the cities of next size and importance so as to give to such cities the financial advantages which the functions of the Subtreasuries give wherever they may be located.

We have had rather a peculiar situation in Baltimore, the seventh city in the United States in size. Right down the line you may say the Federal reserve banks were given to the cities in proportion to their size and financial importance; but when it came to Baltimore there was a jump—a jump to the thirty-fifth city in the United States—namely, Richmond. Under

other circumstances, if we had had a Federal reserve bank in Baltimore, we would not have been able to have our bankers come to Washington and tell the committee of the House how important the Subtreasury was. They would have simply said, "Go ahead; we will transact this business through the Federal reserve bank."

I have no objection, Mr. President, to giving Federal reserve banks, wherever they may be located, powers similar to those that the Subtreasuries now exercise, but I do say that, in addition to the Federal reserve banks, the Subtreasuries should be preserved and should be further distributed throughout the country.

In the hearing we had before the House Committee on Appropriations when it was proposed to single out Baltimore and, in addition to the disadvantage of not having given her a Federal reserve bank, to which she was entitled in view of her size, business, and the volume of the financial transactions of our great Maryland city, it was proposed to take away the subtreasuryship also. Under such circumstances, Mr. President, we had quite a rally of our bankers. They came over here and told the House committee that the expenditure of \$40,000, which the Government makes in Baltimore to maintain the subtreasurer's office, saves the city a direct outlay, in the opinion of those bankers, \$200,000 a year just as a cash cost, and that the advantage to Baltimore in other ways was very large, and not a matter of dollars and cents. I want to read very briefly, in conclusion, from the testimony of Mr. Ingie, who is the president of the Baltimore Trust Co., and who, as a banking man, would naturally lean to putting this power in the hands of a Federal reserve bank, if there were one in Baltimore; but there being none in Baltimore, he states very clearly how important this Subtreasury is to that city. Mr. Ingie says:

We find in having no reserve bank but in having a Subtreasury we are greatly inconvenienced for the very reasons I have told you about. We have not only all these little currency exchanges and nickels and smaller currency cared for immediately on the premises; but we are a community of 700,000 people, and as a part of the population of the United States entitled to some little measure of consideration in the expense undertaken by the Government on behalf of the people as a whole; and that expense, mark you, is \$40,000 in serving a community of 700,000 people. But, as a banking proposition, as a matter of convenience, we put our money down there and get the certificates of the Subtreasury which we use as clearing-house funds, in \$10,000 certificates. We make all of our 5 per cent deposits in there in cash from day to day, deposits in the redemption of circulating notes, all the deposits for transfer of funds, and so on. That represents deposits made in cities like Norfolk or wherever there is a collector of internal revenue or what not, and where they want to transfer funds in any particular direction they will ask us to make the deposit for them; and I could give you a whole lot of reasons, most important to those immediately in touch, why we should not be deprived of this very small look-in on the beneficence of the Government.

Continuing, at another place, he said:

That is only one instance of many other facilities which it furnishes the banks, and through the banks the community at large. As Mr. Homer—

The president of the Baltimore Clearing House—

said, there is a great demand there for nickels. Baltimore is the seat of the principal packing industry in the country—I believe that is not an overstatement—in fruits and vegetables and oysters, and such matters as that. They will go to the Subtreasury and get \$1,000 worth of nickels instead of having little tin tags, and so on, to pay a man every time he shucks a quart of oysters, and every time he shucks out a quart of oysters they pass him out a nickel. Now, as you say, that oyster packer could go to Mr. Homer's bank and ask for \$500 worth of nickels, and Mr. Homer could go to the Subtreasury and get the nickels and pass them over to his customer; but it all comes from the Subtreasury. Our subtreasurer is altogether indifferent as to whether he pays it to Mr. Homer's messenger or to the messenger of the packer, but it saves the labor of one man in the premises to get them direct. Take the railway system of Baltimore. They deal directly, not because the banks unloaded it on the Government, but that is a very large corporation. It handles a very large quantity of small change of one kind and another. Ordinarily, it would have to go to the bank, and the bank would probably count it and it would go to the Subtreasury and be counted again. Under the practice of the Treasurer's office many large enterprises of that sort deal with the Subtreasury, and it is a very great convenience indeed.

Mr. President, there is one other feature about which I want to speak in connection with which, it has always seemed to me, the functions of the Subtreasury should be enlarged rather than decreased. I refer to the question of the sanitary cleanliness of money. I believe that the insanitary condition of the circulating medium in this country should be changed, as far as possible, and that one of the present functions of the Subtreasuries all over the country should be increased and additional power and facility given the public for keeping money clean from a sanitary standpoint. One of the great changes of the future, as science further fights disease, will be added care and expenditure by the National Government, especially in the great cities, to prevent the currency from circulating contagion. Under those circumstances, and viewing the question either as a financial proposition or as a health proposition, the Subtreas-

uries should not be abolished, but, on the contrary, they should be more wisely distributed and their functions should be increased.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], I desire to add to the debate just a word. Since the statement was made that the Subtreasuries were maintained because of political conditions, it will be interesting to know what the real facts are. I have since inquired of one of the Congressmen from the Cincinnati district, and I find that the office force of the Subtreasury in Cincinnati consists of the assistant treasurer and 16 subordinates. The assistant treasurer is a Democrat; the 16 subordinates are all Republicans; and I dare say that those 16 Republicans are safer under a Democratic chief than 16 Democrats would be under a Republican chief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], but I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I feel at liberty to vote and vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence I feel constrained to withhold my vote.

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]. I understand that if present he would vote as I propose to vote. Therefore I record my vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], but I am privileged to vote on this bill, and I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on account of illness, and I am paired with him for the day. Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLLIER] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). I inquire if the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have a pair with that Senator and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (after having voted in the negative). I desire to ask if the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CLARK (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who, I understand, is absent from the city. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. REED. I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. STONE] has been called from the city on some important matters, and that it is absolutely impossible for him to be here.

Mr. BRADY. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and therefore withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—15.			
Borah	Gronna	Nelson	Sutherland
Brandegee	Kenyon	Norris	Watson
Cummins	Lippitt	Poindexter	Works
Curtis	McCumber	Smoot	
NAYS—45.			
Ashurst	Dillingham	Johnson, Me.	Myers
Bankhead	Fall	Kern	Oliver
Beckham	Fletcher	Lane	Overman
Broussard	Gallinger	Lee, Md.	Page
Bryan	Hardwick	Lewis	Phelan
Catron	Hughes	Lodge	Pittman
Chamberlain	Husting	McLean	Pomerene
Culberson	James	Martine, N. J.	Ransdell

Reed
Saulsbury
Shafroth
Sheppard

Sherman
Smith, Ga.
Smith, Md.
Smith, S. C.

Thomas
Thompson
Walsh
Warren

Weeks

NOT VOTING—36.

Brady
Chilton
Clapp
Clark
Colt
du Pont
Fernald
Goff
Gore

Harding
Hitchcock
Hollis
Johnson, S. Dak.
Jones
Kirby
La Follette
Lea, Tenn.
Martin, Va.

Newlands
O'Gorman
Owen
Penrose
Robinson
Shields
Simmons
Smith, Ariz.
Smith, Mich.

Sterling
Stone
Swanson
Tillman
Townsend
Underwood
Vardaman
Wadsworth
Williams

So Mr. NELSON'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 2, page 103, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made for the Bureau of Education, whether for salaries or expenses or any other purpose connected therewith, shall be used in connection with any money contributed or tendered by the General Education Board or any corporate or other organization or individual in any way associated with it, either directly or indirectly, or contributed or tendered by any corporation or individual other than such as may be contributed by State, county, or municipal agencies; nor shall the Bureau of Education receive any moneys for salaries or any other purpose for the General Education Board or any corporate or other organization or individual in any way associated with it, either directly or indirectly, or contributed or tendered by any corporation or individual other than such as may be contributed by State, county, or municipal agencies, except by act of Congress authorizing the same. Any person violating any or either of the terms of this proviso shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not less than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, as the court may determine.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, my reason for presenting this amendment to the pending bill is because of the activities that have been indulged in through the Bureau of Education by agencies which seem to me to be inimical to the education of the youth of this country. A little over a year ago I introduced, and there was passed through the Senate, a resolution calling upon the secretaries of the different executive departments for information showing what funds were contributed by either the Rockefeller Foundation or the Carnegie Foundation to the activities of the several bureaus of this Government. There was a reply from each one of the departments—from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of the Interior; in fact, from all the departments of the Government—and the reply in every case in answer to that resolution was, in substance, that there were no moneys being received from either the Carnegie Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation for the work of those several departments or their bureaus.

Now, that reply from the Bureau of Education was measurably true. It stated a part of the truth, but it did not state all of the truth. Acting upon information that I have since received, I find that while it may be true that there is no money being received from either of these foundations directly, yet moneys are being paid in the way of salaries to individuals who are in the employ of these different corporate agencies, and they are at the same time nominally employees of the Government of the United States, because they are also on the pay roll of the United States at salaries of \$1 per annum. In other words, the main salaries are paid by those who I claim ought not to have anything to do with the education of the children of this country. I know not from whence the money comes for these different salaries.

When my attention was directed to the fact that that resolution stated the truth only in part, I prepared another resolution, more searching and direct in its terms, and it, too, was passed by the Senate. A reply has just come from the Bureau of Education, to which the request was alone directed this time. The reply, Mr. President, shows a condition of things that this Government ought to crush now and put an end to methods that ought to be followed only by the Government of the United States. If any individual or corporation wants to contribute money to the Bureau of Education or to the Agricultural Department, or to any other department of the Government, there is no reason in the world why the consent of Congress should not be received as a condition precedent to the acceptance of these or any other gifts.

I presume the attention of the Senate has not been called to the report that just came in. It has been printed by the Appropriations Committee, to whom the report was referred.

Mr. OVERMAN. When was it referred to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It was referred to the Committee on Appropriations on the 19th of January. Probably it ought to have gone to the Committee on Education and Labor, but it went to the Appropriations Committee.

It will appear from this report, Mr. President, that there are innumerable persons on the pay roll of the Bureau of Education acting in different capacities where the salaries paid by the Government of the United States are \$1 per annum and where the salaries paid by outside agencies run up as high as six, eight, and ten thousand dollars per annum.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to know, if the Senator can furnish me the information, why a man getting \$10,000 is put on the Government pay roll at \$1. Can the Senator give me any information as to that?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am frank to say that I have not had the opportunity to give the subject the investigation to which it is entitled since the report came in, because I have been engaged all the time with the Military Affairs Committee; but my own impression is that the persons named in the report have, to some extent, the benefit of the franking laws through the Bureau of Education.

Let me illustrate what might well happen: Some great educator of this country, who may be ever so highly respected by our people, writes a thesis on some great educational subject that may be very near to the hearts of the American people, and yet he has no way of getting it before the people except as he may be able to pay to get his literature distributed, or in so far as he may be able to get the press to publish it; and yet one of these pets of the Bureau of Education, Mr. President, may get his answer to it, or his own view, before the American people through the franking privilege. This may not be done directly, but ways may be and are devised to accomplish it, as I shall hereafter show.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. JONES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not see how that can possibly be done—I mean, under the law now existing. There is no franking privilege granted to any individual in a bureau or a department, and the only things that can be distributed under the franking privilege are governmental documents, Senate documents, or House documents. Of course if they were made Senate documents or House documents or governmental documents, then of course they could go through the mails free; but in order to do that of course they would have to have the head of the bureau or the head of the department have them printed as department documents.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am going to call your attention now to what has already developed in connection with this matter, in answer to the Senator from North Carolina and the suggestion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say that it is not done. I am only saying to the Senator that the only way that I can see how it could be done is as I have suggested. I do not say that it has not been done in that way.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. JONES. I was just going to suggest that they take that means of making it a public document or an official document of the bureau, and it not only goes out, possibly, under the Government frank, but also with the apparent stamp of approval of the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; it goes out from a Federal bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. Then of course the department itself assumes that it is a Government document, and has it printed as such.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

When I introduced this resolution I began to get letters from all over this country in reference to it and commending my course. I received this morning a letter from an educational institution at River Falls, Wis., as to the methods that were being adopted to corrupt or change the educational methods in vogue, and that have been in vogue for a good many years, and directing them along channels that they ought not to go. Amongst other gentlemen who have written me letters on this subject is Mr. William H. Allen, director of the Institute for

Public Service, City Hall Square, 51 Chambers Street, New York City.

As soon as this resolution was introduced he took up the matter with me. I do not know what relation he may have to any other institution so far as this subject is concerned, and I do not care, but I wrote to him and I wanted to know more, and I am apologizing to the Senate because I have not had time to get to the bottom of this thing. I received a letter from him on the 18th—that was the day before this report was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and the letter was written before the report was printed—and I take the liberty of reading his reply to the Senate, in order to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to this matter. Mr. Allen has had experience in work of this kind, and I am indebted to him for the information which his letter gives and for the suggestions he makes. He says amongst other things:

Very many thanks for your letter of January 12 referring to the resolution introduced by you re foundations and asking for information which I may have with respect to Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, etc.

May I first make a suggestion or two with regard to the resolution itself, namely, that when reviewing the information furnished by the Department of the Interior you have in mind:

1. The franking privileges given to a number of agencies or individuals, as, for example, Prof. Judd, of the University of Chicago—

Now, nobody will ever charge that institution with being entirely free from the Rockefeller influence—

ostensibly to conduct an investigation for the United States Bureau of Education. This has meant in several instances not merely that private individuals have sent out questionnaires without postage cost, but that their reports have been issued by the bureau at public expense, and—which is more important—in the name of the bureau.

So that you see pamphlets and documents emanating from the Chicago University go out with the stamp of approval, as the Senator from Washington says, of the Government on them. That is not right. It ought to be stopped, and it will be when the people understand it.

Mr. OVERMAN. With the Government frank?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes. I am not questioning the integrity of its methods at all. I do not know anything about it; but in the very nature of things no single educational institution in this country ought to be permitted to send out its views with the stamp of approval of the Government of the United States when there are so many other institutions that might not approve of them at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. In order that it shall be printed as a departmental document it must of necessity carry with it the indorsement of the department, or else it would not be a departmental document.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is just what I am complaining of—that whenever these pets of the Chief of the Bureau of Education come to him with a document, he can easily find a way to make it a Government publication and give it the franking privilege, whereas some man who happened not to be so well favored by the bureau might knock at the door until doomsday and not have his document receive any governmental recognition, so that it, too, could go out.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand the Senator to assume, at least, if not to claim, that these men who receive \$1 per annum compensation from the department are the pets of the department?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Some of them; yes. I make that charge here and now.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. WORKS. Is it not to be presumed that they all are?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; it is to be presumed that they all are.

Mr. WORKS. I am a little in doubt, however, whether this—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator is going to call attention to the amendment itself, will he not wait until I get rid of this matter? Then I shall be glad to have any suggestions made with reference to the amendment. My purpose is to cut out these private activities, and to let the Government itself control the education of the youth of this country in its own way.

Secondly, Mr. Allen calls my attention to matters that I ought to consider and that the Senate ought to consider. He says further:

2. Persons whose salaries are paid from private funds, and whose work is really that of private agencies, have been attached to the

United States Bureau, written letters in its name, etc. Personally, I believe this is an excellent thing, provided there is supervision by the bureau, which will prevent its being exploited.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if the Senator knows whether the stationery that they use is furnished to these people by the Government? The stationery bills at this time are very large, and we have had to increase the appropriations for that purpose to a certain extent. Can the Senator tell me whether or not stationery is furnished these officers who get \$1 per annum from the Government?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know about that. I would not undertake to say. If I were to be permitted to express my personal opinion about this matter, I would say that the whole bureau and its methods ought to be investigated by the Congress of the United States. I think the people of this country ought to know, just as they did in the case of the Agricultural Department, just where these activities come from and who is putting up the money. The Government of the United States is big enough and able to put up all the money necessary to educate the children or to direct the educational institutions as the people may see fit.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. JONES. Does the report that the Senator has set out the names of the persons and the institutions from which their compensation really comes?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I wondered about that, because I had printed in the RECORD of the last session, at page 12028, a compilation that I got from the Department of Education which showed that there were 144 of these special officers.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was not advised of that. I wish I had seen it.

Mr. JONES. This matter was called to my attention, and I wrote to all the departments of the Government asking them to send to me the number and list of names of those who were in their employ at nominal salaries, the balance of their compensation being paid by some one else. That is printed beginning at page 12027 of the RECORD of last session; and under the report of the Bureau of Education they give a list comprising 144 names, giving the names of the individuals and the agency that pays the real salary to them. I did not know whether this report furnished that or not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think it does. I think it furnishes the whole business. I have not read it, but I shall ask to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Let me say here that Mr. Allen had to do, if I mistake not, with the Industrial Commission, and investigated this branch of the subject. I have not had an opportunity to look into it, but I think the Senate will find that there is published in that some of the results of his investigation.

Mr. Allen says:

3. Another kind of service which can do much injury is free service by persons who have influence with the commissioner and who write opinions about educational work for incorporation in the commissioner's report.

Now, note this. This is a reputable man, I assume. I do not know him personally:

Last year I protested against one such case because an admirable piece of work which was nearly 100 per cent successful for eight normal schools in Wisconsin was disparagingly and almost casually disposed of by the United States commissioner, who partially shifted the responsibility by saying it was the opinion of Prof. Judd, of the University of Chicago.

The same professor who has the benefit of the franking privilege in order to send out his effusions to the people of this country. What show has an individual as against such influence as that—a man who is paid \$6,000 a year, and the Government pays him one dollar.

Mr. POINDEXTER. One dollar a year?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir; one dollar a year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is the purpose of that one dollar?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suppose it is to give them standing as officials of the Government. I do not know what else it is given for. I want to call attention to the fact that this subject was gone into here a year or two ago in reference to the Agricultural Department. Here was this great branch of the public service honeycombed with these same influences that I am complaining about now. Congress very promptly took the matter in hand, the Senate will remember, and fixed it so that they could not do it unless they did it in some underhand way. To avoid the suggestion which came to us at that time that these particular foundations were doing the work, they have now split up into little subsidiary corporations and are

that when public officers are in sympathy with a civic body it should publish no facts that would lead the public to criticize or to condemn. Like the General Education Board, the Rockefeller Foundation is in no real sense a foundation, as the complete control of it is in the hands of a small group in Mr. Rockefeller's personal office. Incidentally, the publicity work for all the Rockefeller Foundation is done by a publicity man, Mr. Ivy Lee, who has no official relation to these foundations and whose publicity work is not submitted to the trustees before going to the publisher.

As to the Carnegie Foundations, there are several which affect college independence. "The gratitude which is a lively sense of favors to come" has given the Carnegie Institution at Washington a great deal of influence. It makes disbursements. Anybody who is not good can not expect to get disbursements.

Analysis will show that though there has been a vast amount of criticism of the institution none of it has been outspoken.

The Carnegie corporation is very quiet as yet. You will remember that it furnished funds for attacking the proposition of the Panama tolls. It represents an enormous influence and has operated very little in the open as yet. There is reason to fear that it has subsidized the publication and advertisement of books by Messrs. Root, Taft, and others which attack modern liberal tendencies in government, and have been rigorously pushed by the Educational Review, of which Mr. Nicholas Murray Butler is editor.

When advertising these reactionary works Mr. Butler has not advertised the fact that he is also officer of several Carnegie Foundations. When attacking numerous educators and applauding the Carnegie Foundation's surveys Editor Butler did not advertise or admit his connection with the Carnegie Foundation.

It is now notorious that the Carnegie pension plan has overreached itself and broken down. Colleges have found their tongues and hearts for the first time in 10 years. A slight investigation shows that while under pension by the Carnegie Foundation the college world has supinely delegated to the foundation responsibilities for studying and settling college questions. By having representatives of State universities on its board the Carnegie Foundation (the same is true of the General Education Board) makes it impossible for these officers to represent their own public.

When a college wants a president almost the first thing it does is to ask the Carnegie Foundation to name somebody. Great public service would be rendered by bringing out this fact clearly.

ATTITUDE TOWARD NATIONAL UNIVERSITY.

Whereas every State university president has been committed in favor of a national university, there is almost a solid line-up of the big private universities against such a public institution. The State university men have done very little to further it; the foundations have not openly opposed; they certainly have not helped, and it is taken for granted that they do not favor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. This document, a copy of which I hold in my hand, No. 684, is a letter transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, signed Franklin K. Lane. I find, in looking it over hurriedly, that there are 152 persons listed here—I think that is approximately accurate, perhaps substantially accurate—who are on the roll at \$1 each per annum. That is the salary they are getting from the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. And then the salary that they are getting from other organizations is likewise stated in another column in most cases; not in all cases. So that the Senator's movement, I think, is very well warranted by the facts that have been developed, which show that something ought to be done.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think so, Mr. President, and that is the purpose of this resolution—to stop it. I do not know of any other way to do it except to limit the appropriations that have been made, or are being sought to be made, by this appropriation bill. I think it but fair to state that Mr. Claxton was appointed under a former administration as head of the Bureau of Education.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice that the list contains at least 150 names, and that the private or corporate body by which the money is paid, over and above the dollar paid by the Government, is given in the list; and I do not find the Carnegie Foundation nor the Rockefeller Foundation in the list.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And you will not find it, because, as I said a while ago, that information came from the Agricultural Department on a resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and showed the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations. You do not see these names any more, or at least they are not so conspicuous.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand that the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations appropriate the money, say, to the Phillips Academy for the payment of Bernard M. Allen?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no means of knowing, and that was the reason why I said that if my personal views were asked I should say the whole bureau ought to be investigated, and I shall probably move an investigation later; but take this one case now. I suppose there are some cases where the gifts are made by perfectly worthy institutions; but I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that there are men there under the

\$1 annual salary paid by the Government of the United States that are on some of these Carnegie and other foundation boards.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice here Calvin N. Kendall. He receives a salary of \$10,000, and he is the State commissioner of education of the State of New Jersey.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I notice one man here who is a professor in a university in my State. He seems to be getting a salary from somebody here, \$1 from the Government, and also a salary from the State. I was wondering whether that prevails all through here. A great many of them are from universities and colleges. Here is the State agent of rural schools for North Carolina. The General Education Board gives him \$2,500. I notice, however, that one of the professors in my State gets \$2,500, and I was wondering if he got a salary from the foundation fund, and another from the State, and then \$1 from the Government, so that he was paid from three sources?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not undertake to say.

Mr. OVERMAN. Here is Fred N. Scott, professor of rhetoric in the University of Michigan. He seems to be getting a salary from the State, \$4,000 from this fund, and \$1 from the Government.

Here is a county superintendent of schools. Here is the president of the State Normal School of Kentucky. He is getting \$3,600 from this fund. Here is a man from Miami University, and another one from Johns Hopkins. In the case of the University of Virginia, here is a man who is professor of agricultural education there, by the name of Abbey, marked "Z." I do not know what that means. Some of them seem to be getting two and three salaries here.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, that is not the worst part of it. It is bad enough as it appears in this report, but that is not the worst influence. Here are men in educational life, striving to accomplish the payment to them of a pension after their terms have expired; so that we find them not only holding out their capacious paws to the youth of the land, controlling their education, but undertaking to reach the educators who are to be dependent upon them and their nefarious pensions in the future.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I was compelled to be out of the Chamber when this matter arose. I should like to ask the Senator how it arises now. Has he offered an amendment to this bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am proposing an amendment to the bill. I will send the Senator a copy of it.

Mr. KENYON. I am glad the Senator has done so, and I am glad this matter is being brought to light.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I ask the Senator from Oregon what privilege these gentlemen are entitled to enjoy by reason of thus being upon the salary list at \$1 per annum? What is the reason why they are thus seeking official position, when as a matter of fact they are in the employment of some private individual?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator was here when I read, in the case of the Chicago University, where Prof. Judd of that university is named in the report as getting \$1 per annum from the Government and \$6,000 a year from the university, and some of his work has had the benefit of the franking privilege. That is one case that is reported to me as having had the benefit of the franking privilege. Not only that, but he is using the franking privilege to answer other educators, and getting his literature distributed at the cost of the Government, while the private individuals can not do it.

Mr. OVERMAN. And they are printing their own documents.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They are printing at Government expense the document of Prof. Judd in reply to a communication or an article written by Dr. Elliot. Now, whether we agree with Dr. Elliot or not is aside from this question; but here is a president of a university using the franking privilege under authority of the Bureau of Education, to circulate his views all over the country at the expense of the Government, while Dr. Elliot, I assume, is compelled to do it at his own expense, if he is sufficiently interested in getting his views before the public.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, is there not something still further—that in using the frank and sending the document through the country under the franking privilege, it carries,

to a certain extent in the public mind at least, the indorsement by the Government of these peculiar or particular views?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It goes out as though it were actually an authoritative publication of the views of the Government. It is issued under the authority of the Government, apparently, as expressing the views of the Government officials themselves.

Mr. President, these institutions are like Providence. They "move in a mysterious way their wonders to perform." Now, I am going to call your attention to another activity along these same lines, to show you that they are moving with military precision all along the line, to get control of the education of the children of the land. I venture to say that if you put the educational system of this country in the hands of any particular class of individuals, in two generations they can practically change the form of our Government by educating the children along certain lines which the ideal of democracy would oppose, if the people thoroughly understood the situation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In that connection I should like to suggest that the framers of the Constitution apprehended some similar danger when they were so careful to legislate against any law establishing religion, and they followed it up by a statute most carefully excluding church control of the public schools of the country. The cult of Rockefeller, the cult of Carnegie, in the viewpoint which they represent in political economy and in government, is just as much to be guarded against in the educational system of the country as a particular religious sect.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think there is any question about it. I do not think any particular set of individuals, whether it be in industrial life, whether it be in railroad life, or whether it be in religious life, ought to have exclusive control of the education of children.

Mr. President, I confess to some feeling about this thing. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and I graduated from the same institution. It has the historical names of Washington and Lee attached to it. There have been efforts by some individuals, I am informed, to get money for that institution from these sources, and I am entirely opposed to its acceptance. As a matter of fact, I would rather educate my boy in a log schoolhouse built by the taxes imposed upon the people than have him receive an education in a marble palace built and maintained by these people.

Now, let us look at another activity of these distinguished financiers.

Mr. JONES. Before the Senator proceeds to another phase of it, I just want to ask him whether he has ascertained who constitutes the National Kindergarten Association?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am frank to say to the Senator, as I stated a while ago, that I did not have an opportunity to examine this report until the bill under consideration was on the heels of passage. It deserves careful consideration. What has this board got to do with immigration, I may ask?

Mr. JONES. Nothing at all. A large salary is paid by some organization of that kind. It would be very easy, of course, as the Senator suggested a moment ago, to have this foundation represented in organizations of that kind. Here is another organization, the National Kindergarten Association, and then the International Kindergarten Union. Their names are very similar. I should like to know whether any Senator here knows what these organizations are and how they are maintained and where they get their funds.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is the reason why I suggested there ought to be an investigation of the bureau, and I hope in considering it we may do it from a nonpartisan viewpoint, because I feel that there is no politics in it. It may be all right, but it does not look right to me. Now, they commence to take charge of kindergarten schools where little children go to kindergarten so that their mothers or fathers may work during a part of the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Do I understand that the effect of the Senator's amendment would be to abolish altogether this scheme of collaboration?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It abolishes the expenditure of the Government appropriation in connection with appropriations coming from any of these foundations or from any other source than a public source like a State, county, or municipality.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then I understand it would take off the roll of this bureau the names of all the people who are now listed at a dollar per annum?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That might be the effect of the amendment, and I think that would not be an unmixed evil.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know whether it would be or not. I am trying to ascertain, because the matter is entirely new to me.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will yield to me a moment, I wish to state that it does not cut off the State officials, as I understand the amendment.

Mr. WORKS. That is just what I wanted to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to—that it did not do that thing and I think it should. But I will pass that for the present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to pass up the question of getting the amendment in proper shape. I am frank to say I made it just as sweeping as I knew how.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should like to ask the Senator who was responsible for this scheme of collaboration at the beginning?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know. Insidious influences have got not only into the educational life of the United States, but it did get into the Agricultural Department, and I do not know how many other departments it has gotten into.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was, I suppose, inaugurated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Does the Senator mean Secretary Lane?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Whoever it was.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It started long ago. If you are going to make politics out of it, Mr. Claxton, I think, is a Republican, and was appointed under a former administration.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator is altogether too suspicious. I had not any thought of politics about it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I hope not. It must have gotten in under some Secretary of the Interior, because the bureau comes under him.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It came in under the Department of the Interior?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. With the sanction of whoever happened to be Secretary at that time?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He must have thought at the time it would serve some wise purpose.

Mr. LANE. Not necessarily so.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not necessarily, but presumptively so; because I think most of our officials may be given credit for honesty of purpose. I should dislike very much to think that any other presumption ought to obtain.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will permit me, my recollection is that it started with the Department of Agriculture. I recollect some amendment which was introduced here on the Agricultural appropriation bill to stop the agents.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will permit me, I agree perfectly that we ought not to have in our public educational matters the predominating influence of private interests. The education of our children ought to be conducted under governmental and public auspices. I agree to that perfectly. But it seems to me that the Senator's amendment is too sweeping, if it destroys this scheme of collaboration altogether, because I can very well see that the influences in many respects might be for good.

Here are in this list over a hundred, somebody, I think, said 150, and on looking over it hastily I should say that the connection of a very large majority of the persons named in the Bureau of Education of the Government would be helpful.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am willing to concede that. I am in accord with the Senator, but we do not know what these influences are or just where this money comes from, except on the surface. I will say to the Senator that some men are on it who are directly connected with the Carnegie Foundation and its boards.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, let those men be gotten rid of.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It will take an investigation to find out the ramifications of these different agencies. For that reason my purpose was to restrict the whole business until that could be done. If these agencies are really what the Senator thinks they are, of benefit—and I agree to that in many cases—why can not the Government pay for them?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the Government should pay for them. I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. My purpose, I will say to the Senator frankly, was to stop the whole business, and then if any of these agencies are valuable—and I do not want anybody to infer that I am charging all these colleges with fraud and unfair dealing, but I do know that some of these people are tied up with these foundations and they ought not to have anything to do with the education of our youth in connection with the Government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A large majority of them are not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I feel reasonably sure about it. I would not vote upon the theory that they are tied up. Here are various State institutions—the Universities of Virginia and Kansas, the University of my State, the University of Montana, and the universities of these other States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. One of the gentlemen connected with the University of Virginia is on one of the Carnegie boards. You do not know what the connections are unless you go to work and investigate it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would it not be better, before we undertake to deal with a question of this importance, to have an investigation and see what the facts are?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think a thorough investigation ought to come later. I will tell the Senator one of the reasons which actuates me, and this has come to me as the result of inquiring into this matter. It comes as a suggestion from Mr. Allen, the director of the Institute of Public Service in New York. I was not authorized by him to print his letter, but I am going to do it, at the possible risk of offense. It was not marked confidential and the public are vitally interested in it. In his letter to me he said:

Apropos foundation influence you probably noticed that the General Education Board has appropriated funds for a test at and by the Teachers College of the Rockefeller board's idea of a "modern school." Will you consider the innumerable ways in which this venture with foundation funds is bound to affect educational standards?

Teachers College—

That is the name of the institution—

Teachers College is part of Columbia University. Yet this experiment is to be directed by a professor from the University of Chicago. On the board of trustees are to be several (four) foundation representatives, including an employee of the General Education Board, a paid employee, and one of its council.

Teachers College is part of Columbia; Columbia wants more money.

That is the way with a lot of these institutions.

Neither Columbia nor Teachers College is free to analyze impartially the proposal which it itself is conducting, even if it felt free to criticize a work of the Rockefeller Foundation. The power of life and death almost is held over school men of the country by the Teachers College and Columbia University. It is practically impossible to get anyone to criticize in the open a venture which starts there.

People who want money from the various Rockefeller foundations consider that the line of quickest access and least resistance is that of applause; so we find overnight a world blindly applauding what many of them disapprove in the hope that their partisanship will find foundation support. Even this is done in a way where, if it fails, it will not be conclusive and the foundations themselves will be "out from under." The blunder can be laid at the door of the Teachers College.

If Congress should pass a law making it impossible for foundations to subsidize other foundations, colleges, charitable agencies, etc., thus compelling foundations to walk in the open and assume responsibility for their own spending, there would be a different initial line up on a proposal like this and an attitude of impartial analysis during the experiment.

That is the reason why I put in the amendment a requirement that whenever these gifts are to be made to the Government of the United States by these institutions or others they must be accepted by an act of Congress. If a proposition came here to present the Government with \$100,000 or \$100,000,000, if it was all right the Congress of the United States would pass an act authorizing its acceptance. It has been done in the case of grants of land to the Government of the United States for military and other purposes where it was free from any question of fraud.

Mr. President, that is all I want. I am perfectly willing to have an investigation, but I want to have this thing stopped until an investigation can be had.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to this: In the Agricultural appropriation act of 1915 this question was discussed on an amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senate concluded to stop the activities of these people. Then there came back from the Department of Agriculture substantially the same sort of report that now comes to us from the Bureau of Education, and after a consideration of the subject this proviso was added to the Agricultural appropriation act that year:

Provided, That the expense of such service shall be defrayed from this appropriation and such cooperative funds as may be voluntarily contributed by State, county, and municipal agencies, associations of farmers and individual farmers, universities, colleges, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, other local associations of business men, business organizations, and individuals within the State.

That amendment in its present form was not made by the Senator from Iowa. It goes too far. I think it has had the effect, however, of cutting out the activities of these people in the Agricultural Department; but it went too far, because these institutions do not deal in the open. They do it underground and through agencies it is hard to uncover. Just exactly as I said, some of the men on this roll are connected with prominent

universities of the country. They are also on the Carnegie board or connected with it in some way and drawing pay.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Oregon has taken up this subject. I have been informed on authority, which I will gladly produce on an investigation of the whole relationship of the Rockefeller Foundation to the Government, which ought to be made, that there are certain colleges in this country that have sought endowments, and the agent of the Rockefeller Foundation or the educational board had gone out and examined the curriculum of these colleges and compelled certain changes to be made in the studies and in the curriculum.

It seems to me that it is one of the most dangerous things that can go on in a Republic to have an institution of this power apparently trying to shape and mold the thought of the young people of the country. The same question arose in the Agricultural appropriation bill. The agricultural colleges then seemed in certain States to be coming under the influence of this organization, and professors who did not teach along the line that they might decree had in some instances been compelled to give up their positions.

I know that great good has been done, of course, along agricultural lines by the Rockefeller Foundation agency in cooperation with the Government, but there is an insidious influence in this thing, there is an unconscious influence all the time in the method by which this work is being carried on, and there ought to be an investigation of the whole subject. Until that time I agree with the Senator from Oregon that it ought to stop. Let us have an investigation of the relationship and work of the Rockefeller Foundation with respect to the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Right along the line the Senator has just stated, I do not recall exactly the circumstances, but they had put down the rating of Washington and Lee University, for instance, a number of years ago, because it was not in the particular class that some of these people connected with the foundation preferred, and I registered a protest with Mr. Claxton. In other words, they can prefer certain of these institutions, giving them a standing before the country, whenever they feel disposed to do so, and can give a college a black eye by simply placing it in a lower category than some of the others.

I think I have said all I care to say about this. I frankly state my purpose is to put this thing entirely out of business, and then it can be investigated, and when we determine what the conditions are we can change it to suit the conditions.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Not having heard of this propaganda before, I am entirely unfamiliar with it. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he is familiar with any of the literature that is being circulated?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have glanced over it occasionally, but not for this purpose. As the Senator can see, I have had only two or three days to look into it, and I have not had an opportunity to get it together.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask whether or not, in obedience to the command or request or plea of any of these boards or organizations, of whatever character they may be, any textbooks have been introduced into any of the colleges as a result of their work?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not prepared to answer the Senator.

Mr. WATSON. In other words, I am trying to find out how far they have carried their work in the various colleges and what the result has been.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That would be involved in an investigation of the whole subject.

Mr. WATSON. I did not know but the Senator had investigated it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; I have not.

Mr. President, I desire to have printed as a part of my remarks the resolution calling upon the Bureau of Education for information and the report thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, such will be the order.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Senate Document No. 684, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session.]
GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD OF THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION AND CARNEGIE FOUNDATION.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

Washington, January 18, 1917.

SIR: In accordance with Senate resolution 307, adopted by the Senate on January 4 (calendar day, January 5), 1917—

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested and directed to furnish to the Senate the following information: The relation, if any, of the organizations known as the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, or any other private or corporate enterprise to the work of the Bureau of Education; a statement showing the names and positions of all employees, if any,

of the Bureau of Education whose salaries are paid in whole or in part from funds contributed by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, or from any other private or corporate funds or from funds derived from any source other than the Government of the United States; the names and positions of all administrative or other officers, if any, of the Bureau of Education who are in any way connected with the work of the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, or any other private or corporate enterprise, and the salaries, if any, received by them from the said Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, or any other private or corporate or other source than the Government of the United States."

I have the honor to transmit herewith the accompanying statement from the Commissioner of Education, which contains all of the data at hand in this department at the present time.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
Washington, January 13, 1917.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In reply to Senate resolution 307, adopted January 4 (calendar day, January 5), 1917, I have the honor to submit the following statement:

There is no relation whatsoever of the organizations known as the General Education Board, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Foundation to the work of the Bureau of Education. The Bureau of Education has entered into cooperative relations with the Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York City, for the purpose of making a study of negro education in the United States; with the National Kindergarten Association, New York City, and the International Kindergarten Union for the purpose of investigating and promoting kindergarten education; with the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations for the purpose of promoting education in the home; and with the Committee for Immigrants in America for the purpose of investigating and promoting the education of adult immigrants in the United States. No funds whatsoever are contributed to the Bureau of Education directly by any of the organizations above mentioned. The organizations with which cooperative arrangements have been made are now providing for the Bureau of Education the services of certain employees whose salaries, however, are paid directly to such persons by the several organizations. The persons whose services are thus furnished the Bureau of Education are under the direct supervision and control of the Commissioner of Education and do such work as is outlined for them by the commissioner.

There have been appointed also from time to time a considerable number of special collaborators throughout the United States who are employed in universities, colleges, and normal schools or who hold other educational positions, such as county superintendent of schools, etc. These persons perform only occasional service for the Bureau of Education, and no cooperative arrangements have been entered into by the institutions or other corporate bodies by which they are regularly employed.

The names of the persons employed by the Bureau of Education under the above-mentioned arrangements are appended hereto in two lists. The first list comprises the persons who have their headquarters in the Bureau of Education at Washington, and who devote practically all of their time to the work of this bureau. The one exception in this list is Dr. Willard S. Small, principal of the Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., who has a desk in the Bureau of Education, but gives to the work of the bureau only such time as can be spared from his regular duties. The second list includes the names of special collaborators employed by the Bureau of Education, who render only very occasional service to the bureau.

Cordially, yours,

P. P. CLAXTON, Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Names of persons who are employed in the Bureau of Education at Washington, D. C., and whose salaries are paid in part by organizations other than the Federal Government.

Name of person.	Position in bureau.	Salary paid by bureau.	Private or corporate body by which salary is paid.	Salary paid by such body.
Thomas Jesse Jones.	Special collaborator.	\$1	Phelps-Stokes Fund.	\$4,500
Ocea Taylor.	do.	1	do.	2,000
Walter B. Hill.	do.	1	do.	1,400
H. H. Wheaton.	do.	1	Committee for Immigrants in America.	2,500
F. E. Farrington.	do.	1	do.	2,400
T. M. Ave-Lallemant.	do.	1	do.	1,500
Martha B. Burzynska.	do.	1	do.	1,200
Paul A. Malone.	do.	1	do.	720
Isabel Malone.	do.	1	do.	600
Marion Berger.	do.	1	National Kindergarten Association.	1,200
Mary L. Allen.	do.	1	do.	520
Almira M. Winchester.	do.	1	International Kindergarten Union.	1,500
Ellen C. Lombard.	do.	1	National Congress Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations.	1,200
Florence E. Frisby.	do.	1	do.	600
Edward J. Ward.	do.	1	None.	None.
Henry E. Jackson.	do.	1	do.	None.
Willard S. Small.	Special agent in rural and industrial education.	(1)	Board of Education of the District of Columbia.	2,500
C. D. Jarvis.	Special collaborator.	1	None.	None

¹ \$10 per day when employed.

Special collaborators employed by the Bureau of Education at a salary of \$1 per annum who render occasional service, with the names of organizations other than the Federal Government, by which additional salaries are paid.

Name of person.	Regular occupation.	Private or corporate body by which salary is paid.	Salary.
Bernard M. Allen.	Instructor in Latin.	Phillips Academy.	\$2,000
Kendric C. Babcock.	Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.	University of Illinois.	5,500
Ben Blewett.	Superintendent of schools.	St. Louis (Mo.) Board of Education.	8,000
A. Maris Boggs.	Dean, Bureau of Commercial Economics.	None.	None.
E. C. Branson.	Professor, rural economics and sociology.	University of North Carolina.	2,500
Edward F. Brown.	Superintendent, bureau of welfare of school children and executive secretary New York school lunch committee.	New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor.	3,500
R. E. Cole.	Member, council on naturalization.	Committee for Immigrants in America.	2,500
Nathan P. Colwell.	Secretary.	American Medical Association.	4,000
Mrs. Grace Davis.	Field agent.	National Kindergarten Association.	(1)
May Delahanty.	Office secretary.	do.	1,500
Richard E. Dodge.	Editor.	Association of American Geographers.	200
Milton Fairchild.	Chairman, Washington executive committee.	National Institution for Moral Instruction (Inc.).	1,800
Jessie Field.	Rural and small town specialist.	National Board, Y. W. C. A.	1,800
Lloyd I. Friend.	State supervisor of high schools and professor of secondary education in West Virginia University.	General Education Board, through West Virginia University.	2,500
L. J. Hanifan.	State supervisor of rural schools.	General Education Board.	2,500
James F. Hosie.	Head of English department, Chicago Normal School.	Chicago Board of Education.	3,500
Henry Israel.	Secretary, county work department.	International committee, Y. M. C. A.	2,900
Charles H. Judd.	Director, school of education.	University of Chicago.	6,000
Calvin N. Kendall.	State commissioner of education.	State of New Jersey.	10,000
Charles H. Keyes.	President.	Skidmore School of Arts, Massachusetts.	6,000
Clarence D. Kingsley.	Agent for high schools.	State Board of Education.	2,600
Esther E. Lape.	Publicity director.	Committee for Immigrants in America.	1,800
Bessie Locke.	Corresponding secretary.	National Kindergarten Association.	2,000
N. C. Newbold.	State agent, rural schools for North Carolina.	General Education Board.	2,500
William F. Osgood.	Professor of mathematics.	Harvard College and Radcliffe College.	6,300
Clarence A. Perry.	Associate director, department of recreation.	Russell Sage Foundation.	3,000
Wm. L. Phelps.	Professor of English literature.	Yale University.	5,000
Mrs. Hannah K. Schoff.	President.	National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations.	None.
Fred N. Scott.	Professor of rhetoric.	University of Michigan.	4,000
C. Alphonso Smith.	Head, school of English.	University of Virginia.	3,300
Miss Louise Schofield.	Clerk.	National Kindergarten Association.	1,200
David Eugene Smith.	Professor of mathematics.	Columbia University.	6,000
George D. Strayer.	Professor of educational administration.	Teachers College, Columbia University.	6,000
Glen L. Swiggett.	Editing proceedings Pan American Congress.	None.	None.
W. K. Tate.	Professor of rural education.	George Peabody College for Teachers.	3,500
A. E. Wagner.	Extension professor.	Ohio University.	2,300
Lenore P. Webster.	Housewife.	None.	None.
C. W. Wright.	County superintendent of schools.	County board of education.	1,800
T. J. Coates.	President, State Normal School.	State of Kentucky.	3,600
B. M. Davis.	Professor of agricultural education.	Miami University.	2,500
Edward F. Buchner.	Director, College of Courses for Teachers and Summer Courses.	Johns Hopkins University.	3,500
Jackson Davis.	General field agent.	General Education Board.
Helen M. Heffernan.	Chairman, Chicago organization.	Illinois Congress of Mothers and Parent Teacher Associations.	None.
R. H. Powell.	President, State Normal School.	State of Georgia.	2,500
S. W. Straus.	S. W. Straus & Co.
W. D. Weatherford.	International committee, Y. M. C. A.	3,000
Lucy Wheelock.	President.	Wheelock Kindergarten Training School.	(2)
Wm. H. Maxwell.	Superintendent of schools.	New York City Board of Education.	10,000

¹ \$100 per month when employed.

² Profits.

Special collaborators employed by the Bureau of Education at a salary of \$1 per annum who render occasional service, etc.—Continued.

Name of person.	Regular occupation.	Private or corporate body by which salary is paid.	Salary.
R. W. Stimson.....	Agent.....	Massachusetts State Board of Education.	\$3,500
B. W. Torreyson.....	Professor of secondary education.	General Education Board, through University of Arkansas.	3,000
Cyrus C. Adams.....	Geographer.....	University of West Virginia.	
Myron J. Abbey.....	Professor of agricultural education.	George Peabody College for Teachers.	
Carter Alexander.....	Professor of school administration.	State of Oregon.	
J. H. Ackerman.....	President, State Normal School.	American School Peace League.	
Fannie Fern Andrews.....	Secretary.....	State of North Carolina.	
S. G. Atkins.....	President State Industrial and State Normal School.	East Carolina Teachers' Training School.	
Herbert E. Austin.....	Professor.....	County board of education.	
N. R. Baker.....	County supervisor of rural schools.	State Board of Education of California.	
Mary G. Barnum.....	Vice president.....	Indiana State Department of Education.	
Adelaide S. Baylor.....	State supervisor of household arts.	Bradley Polytechnic Institute.	
Charles A. Bennett.....	Professor of manual arts.	Mothers' Congress and Parent-Teachers' Associations.	
Helen T. Birney.....		Michigan Agricultural College.	
George W. Bissell.....	Professor of mechanical engineering.	State of Arkansas.	
James L. Bond.....	State superintendent of public instruction.	Southern Conferences for Education and Industry.	
Albert P. Bourland.....	Executive secretary.....	State Department of Public Instruction of Louisiana.	
Cyrus J. Brown.....	Rural-school supervisor.	State of Michigan.	
Ernest Burnham.....	Director, rural-school department, State Normal School.	University of Minnesota.	
Richard Burton.....	Professor of English.	Minnesota State Department of Public Instruction.	
Mabel Carney.....	Supervisor teacher, training department.	Teachers' Retirement Board of Massachusetts.	
Edmund S. Cogswell.....	Secretary.....	Leland Stanford Junior University.	
R. W. Corwin.....	Physician.....	University of Montana.	
Ellwood P. Cubberley.....	Professor of education.	University of Texas.	
Margaret C. Curran.....	Chancellor.....	University of Mississippi.	
Edward C. Elliott.....	Professor.....	University of Nebraska.	
A. Caswell Ellis.....	State high-school inspector.	Grand Rapids (Mich.) Board of Education.	
John C. Fant.....	State supervisor of negro schools.	Whitman College.	
Leo M. Favrot.....	Professor of history.	South Carolina department of public instruction.	
Fred M. Fling.....	Professor of history.	Harvard University.	
Fred B. Frazier.....	Superintendent of schools.	County board of education.	
Edward A. Freeman.....	Professor of political science.	University of Virginia.	
Charles G. Haines.....	State high-school inspector.	University of Kansas.	
William H. Hand.....	Professor of education.	University of Illinois.	
Paul H. Hanus.....	Teacher, Porter Rural School.	Deer River (Minn.) board of education.	
Marie T. Harvey.....	Executive secretary, trustees of Massachusetts training schools.	Elizabeth McCormick memorial fund.	
Frank L. Hayford.....	Professor of education.	Wisconsin State Department of Education.	
William H. Heck.....	Professor of rhetoric and English language.	George Peabody College for Teachers.	
Miss Caroline Hedger.....	Professor of secondary education.	Florida State Department of Education.	
Edwin M. Hopkins.....	Superintendent of schools.	North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.	
C. H. Johnston.....	Director.....	Bureau of Welfare of School Children.	
George E. Keenan.....	State inspector of rural schools.	University of Virginia.	
Sherman C. Kingsley.....	Professor of Latin.	Colorado State Normal School.	
Walter E. Larson.....	State supervisor of rural schools.	Louisiana State Board of Health.	
Charles E. Little.....	State rural school inspector.		
George M. Lynch.....	Investigator.....		
N. C. Macdonald.....	Professor of secondary education.		
Frank A. Manny.....	Professor of school administration.		
Charles G. Maplis.....	Agent.....		
W. B. Mooney.....			
Agnes Morris.....			

Special collaborators employed by the Bureau of Education at a salary of \$1 per annum who render occasional service, etc.—Continued.

Name of person.	Regular occupation.	Private or corporate body by which salary is paid.	Salary.
John F. Murray.....	Professor of nature study.	University of Utah.	
Joshua H. Paul.....	High school inspector.	Minnesota Department of Public Instruction.	
Eugene M. Phillips.....	Superintendent of schools.	Birmingham (Ala.) Board of Education.	
John H. Phillips.....	Director.....	Charleston (S. C.) Museum.	
Paul W. Rea.....	Professor of secondary education.	State University of Kentucky.	
McHenry Rhoads.....	do.....	George Peabody College for Teachers.	
Wm. F. Russell.....	Professor of rural and industrial education.	Colorado Agricultural College.	
C. G. Sargent.....	Professor of education.	University of North Dakota.	
K. B. Schlaegel.....	Professor of the English language.	University of Kansas.	
Charles C. Schmidt.....	Field secretary.	Playground & Recreation Association of America.	
James W. Searson.....	County superintendent of schools.	County board of education, Colorado.	
Thomas S. Settle.....	Professor of Greek and classical philology.	University of Wisconsin.	
Joseph H. Shriber.....	President.....	North Dakota School of Forestry.	
Charles F. Smith.....	do.....	Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College.	
Fred W. Smith.....	Superintendent of schools.	Minneapolis (Minn.) Board of Education.	
W. H. Smith.....	President.....	Kentucky Illiteracy Commission.	
F. E. Spaulding.....	Industrial department, public schools.	Portland (Oreg.) Board of Education.	
Cora Wilson Stewart.....	State high school inspector and professor, rural education.	University of Florida.	
L. L. Summers.....	Professor of school administration.	University of Pennsylvania.	
John A. Thackston.....	Dean of school of commerce.	Dakota Wesleyan University.	
Harlan Updegraff.....	Inspector of high schools.	University of North Dakota.	
S. D. van Benthuyzen.....	Professor of geography.	University of Wisconsin.	
N. W. Walker.....	State supervisor of normal schools.	Ohio State Board of Education.	
Mrs. C. P. Weaver.....	Professor of physical education.	Columbia University.	
Ray H. Whitbeck.....	Student.....	do.....	
Henry G. Williams.....	Dean of rural department.	Idaho State Normal School.	
Thomas D. Wood.....	Professor of education.	University of Pennsylvania.	
Thos. J. Wooster, Jr.....	Professor of mathematics.	University of Chicago.	
Earl S. Wooster.....			
A. Duncan Yocum.....			
J. W. A. Young.....			

Mr. WORKS. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that, in my judgment, he is not going to accomplish by this amendment all he desires to accomplish. I wish to suggest that the following be added to it at the appropriate place:

Nor shall any person, paid in whole or in part by any such corporation or individual for services rendered by him, be employed by the Government or become or remain an officer or employee of the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am perfectly willing to have that inserted.

Mr. WORKS. That phase of it, I think, is not covered by the amendment. It simply provides that the Board of Education shall not accept money from these outside sources, and it does not prevent the employment of people who may be paid wholly by the Rockefeller Foundation as some of the institutions of that sort are. I think the Government ought to be kept separate and apart entirely from any outside influence in the matter of education. I think it is a very dangerous thing to allow any of these private institutions to interfere or become influential in the educational work of the Government.

Since I came into the Senate there was a bill introduced providing for the incorporation of the Rockefeller Foundation, a new corporation, for educational purposes. Perhaps it has gone out of the mind of Senators. It was never discussed here except that in a speech I made myself I referred to its provisions, but it actually passed the House of Representatives. Let me call the attention of the Senate to some of the provisions that are contained in that proposed legislation. One of the sections is as follows:

That for the promotion of such objects the said corporation shall have power to establish, maintain, and endow, or to aid others, whether individuals, associations, or corporations, to establish, maintain, and endow institutions and other agencies for carrying on said objects, and

any of them; to purchase, hold, sell, and convey real estate necessary for the said corporate objects, and to erect, improve, enlarge, and equip buildings or other structures necessary or convenient for said objects, or any of them, and to acquire, make, and furnish all necessary or convenient apparatus and other accessories; to employ and aid others to employ teachers, lecturers, assistants, and agents; to donate to any individual, association, or corporation engaged in similar work, money or property, real or personal, which shall at any time be held by the said corporation hereby constituted, subject to the terms of any gift, grant, bequest, or devise by which the said corporation shall have received the same.

And again it was provided—

That the total amount of property held at any one time, including that which is held absolutely as well as that which is held in trust, shall not exceed the value of \$100,000,000, exclusive of increases in the value of property subsequent to its receipt by said corporation.

The bill was so broad in its terms that it provided a corporation that might enter into and control almost every educational institution of the country. It might aid in the employment of teachers, the payment of them, supplying the apparatus necessary to carry on the educational work, and at the time I undertook to say something about the bill before it reached the Senate in discussing another question. It never was taken up in the Senate. But it simply shows the tendency on the part of these people who are attempting to get control of the whole educational work of this country. I think it is a very dangerous tendency.

It is for that reason that I have suggested to the Senator from Oregon that there had better be a provision here preventing the employment by the Government of any people who are under the pay of any of these institutions.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Will the Senator indicate where it ought to go in and I will be very glad to accept the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. While the Senator from California is looking into this matter I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon for information whether it is the fact that any employee of the Bureau of Education is at liberty to prepare any kind of a pamphlet he sees fit and have it printed and circulated under frank. Is there any law which authorizes such a privilege?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know of any law that would authorize these people as agents here to use the franking privilege, but suppose one of them did?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is no law to authorize it; but here comes a document from one of the agencies here. Here is the instance I gave a while ago, cited by Mr. Allen, who has had some experience in investigating these subjects. He says:

The franking privilege is given to a number of agencies or individuals, as, for example, Prof. Judd, of the University of Chicago, ostensibly to conduct an investigation for the United States Bureau of Education.

Suppose Mr. Claxton says: "I want you, Mr. Judd, to investigate a certain particular governmental function"—on immigration or anything that he may want to have investigated. He investigates it as an agent of the Government and Mr. Claxton puts it in—

Mr. WALSH. It then becomes a Government publication, and is issued and forwarded by the Bureau of Education.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; but it is the propaganda of an individual—of Mr. Judd.

Mr. OVERMAN. Some man wants to get his view promulgated, and at \$1 a year he is employed to do it.

While I am on my feet I want to say that I spoke of the professor of a university and I inquired whether he was not getting three salaries—one from the foundation, one from the State, and one from the Government. I find that is not true, that he is getting a salary of \$2,500 as professor at the university, and the Government then is putting him on the roll at \$1 for some purpose. In almost all the colleges and universities of the country there is a roll, and they are getting \$1.

I think the Senator from Oregon is doing a very valuable service to the country. I am sorry he did not bring this matter before our committee so that we could investigate it. We knew nothing in the world about it. I am going to accept the amendment; I shall not object to it, so that the conferees can investigate this matter and have Prof. Claxton before us and explain it. Then it will be in conference and we ought to take such action in conference as is proper. I am glad that the Senator brought it to our attention so that we can take some action. We will investigate it thoroughly if we have the time, and I expect the House conferees to agree with us to do it.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, this is so plain a proposition, to my mind, that it does not seem to call for additional investigation. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon the insertion of what I have already indicated after the word "same" and just before the penal clause in his amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am perfectly satisfied to accept that and make it a part of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, after the word "same," just preceding the penal clause, the following words:

Nor shall any person paid in whole or in part by any such corporation or individual for services rendered by him be employed by the Government or become or remain an officer or employee of the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has made certain amendments to the bill, two of which have been reserved for a separate vote.

Mr. HUSTING. I reserve the right to offer an amendment to section 7.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand that section 7 has been reserved for a separate vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the other amendments made as in Committee of the Whole save those which have been reserved.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The following amendment was reserved for a separate vote, and it will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] reserved for a separate vote the amendment on page 51, lines 6 and 7, after the words "draftsman \$1,500," insert "private secretary for captain commandant, \$1,400."

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand that was reserved for a point of order to be made on it, and according to a ruling of the Chair yesterday it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Pending a disposition of that, I desire to inquire of the Chair whether House bill 408 was laid before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was laid down and temporarily laid aside. The question is on concurring in the amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] reserved a separate vote in the Senate on the amendment on page 117, beginning in line 6, and ending in line 18.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I offer the amendment to that amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 117, line 18, after the word "department," it is proposed to insert as a new paragraph the following:

The office of postmaster in each class shall hereafter be a nonpolitical office, and shall be within the classified civil service, and appointments thereto shall be made in accordance with the civil-service rules and, so far as practicable, by promotion, or transfer, upon merit, without regard to politics, from the employees of the Post Office Department, subject to the permanent civil-service regulations and requirements.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, that amendment is in accordance with the recommendation of the Postmaster General, which is found on page 40 of his annual report for 1916. The Postmaster General there states:

The classifying of the position of postmaster of the fourth class has proven so satisfactory that there is every service reason why the classified service should be extended to include the position of postmaster at offices of the first, second, and third classes, and that legislation looking to that end is recommended on page 54 of this report.

He there sets out a draft of legislation containing in substance the amendment which I have offered.

Some time ago I had the matter investigated by the expert of the Bureau of Efficiency as to its effect upon the service, and it was estimated by him and by officials of the Post Office Department, that if the same principles of merit and efficiency were applied to the selection of postmasters and determining their qualifications, as applied in the classified civil service of the Post Office Department, it would not only improve the service, it would not only tend toward a better conduct of the business of the various post offices, but that it would save directly between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000 a year.

During the discussion of an amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], in charge of the bill, the other day, for an examination as to the duplication of work in the various bureaus and departments of the Government, he stated his desire to save \$30,000,000, and so it occurred to me that an amendment upon this section of the bill, in line with the transfer there authorized, to save the small

sum of \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 a year would be very appropriate.

Of course, Mr. President, it would make some political difference in the conduct of the administration and of the changing administrations from term to term; but I imagine that it would be a great relief to the President of the United States. I know it would be a great relief to the Members of the House of Representatives, speaking of them not as Members of the House, however, officially, but as individual referees, to whom, under the custom of political patronage, is referred the selection of postmasters in their several districts. I know that it is frequently regarded as a political asset, though it is really a political liability. It is of no advantage politically or governmentally to any Member of Congress in either branch of Congress to have the duty and the power, if we choose to call it so, of selecting postmasters.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will accept the amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. POINDEXTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print, in connection with my remarks upon the amendment I offered affecting postmasters, a portion of a message of President Taft of February 26, 1913.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REDUCTIONS BY ELIMINATION OF SINECURES.

With respect to the first class, I have already submitted recommendations to Congress in several messages transmitting reports in which it is estimated that the direct salary cost of the Government may be reduced not less than \$4,500,000 a year—this to be done by placing a large proportion of presidential appointments in the classified service. The salaries of postmasters of the first and second classes amount to over \$6,000,000, while the salaries of assistant postmasters of the same classes amount to \$2,820,000. If the position of postmaster were placed in the classified service, and these officers were given salaries equal to 20 per cent more than the salaries now given to assistant postmasters, the latter positions being no longer required, there would be a saving of \$4,512,000. Besides this direct reduction that might be immediately made in the estimates, there would also be very large indirect reductions of cost that might be availed of in future estimates—reductions that can not be realized so long as appointments are on a partisan basis. These unnecessary indirect costs are due to the fact that a considerable part of the services outside of Washington can not be properly brought within the discipline of administrative officers. So long as high salaried local officers owe their appointments to local influence it may be assumed that their tenures will be fairly secure, regardless of their efficiency. This is discouraging to those in equally responsible positions who are rendering efficient service, but who, by reason of the nonpartisan character of the appointment, receive not more than half the amount of salary; it tends to destroy the esprit de corps, especially with subordinates; it carries with it expenditures that in many instances are unwisely made. Altogether, in the opinion of those who are best acquainted with the service, the indirect saving to the Government amounts to more than the direct saving indicated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to; and without objection, the amendment made in Committee of the Whole as amended is concurred in.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think section 7 of the bill is the only remaining one which has been reserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Section 7 has been reserved.

Mr. JONES. I suggest the absence of a quorum, if we have reached section 7.

Mr. OVERMAN. I merely want a vote; I do not desire any debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Overman	Smoot
Bankhead	Hughes	Page	Sterling
Beckham	Husting	Pittman	Sutherland
Borah	James	Poinexter	Thomas
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Thompson
Catron	Jones	Ransdell	Vardaman
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Clapp	Lane	Shafroth	Warren
Culbertson	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Watson
Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Weeks
Dillingham	Nelson	Smith, Ca.	Works
du Pont	Norris	Smith, Md.	
Gallinger	Oliver	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on concurring in the amendments to section 7 as made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The question arises in this way: I understand that those who are in favor of the so-called Smoot amendment will vote "yea" and those who are opposed to it will vote "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to have the vote taken as it was taken originally. I move to strike out section 7 as amended, and get the vote in that way.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from North Carolina move to strike out section 7?

Mr. OVERMAN. I move to strike out section 7.

Mr. SMOOT. As amended?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; the original section, and then the vote to strike out will be "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER. I should think the question would be upon concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. OVERMAN. What I suggest will amount to the same thing.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know; but the parliamentary situation is as I have stated it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see how the Chair could change the rule of the Senate in putting the question.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then, as I understand the Chair, the vote will be as to whether or not we shall strike out the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the reserved question for a vote in the Senate was whether or not the Senate would concur in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole. The amendment made as in Committee of the Whole was, as the Chair understands, to change the House text, and not to strike it out. If the Senate should refuse to concur in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole, then the vote would come on striking out the original paragraph.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Smoot amendment has not been reserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been.

Mr. OVERMAN. The question is whether or not the Senate will agree to section 7 as amended by the Smoot amendment, the committee having brought a report here to strike out the whole section. So if the Senate refuses to strike out the whole section, the Smoot amendment will remain in the bill. If the Senate agrees to strike it out, that strikes out the whole section. The question is whether or not the Senate will strike it out. The Smoot amendment is already agreed to; no Senator reserved it for a separate vote; but the question was reserved on striking out section 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] reserved it for a separate vote.

Mr. OVERMAN. No Senator reserved the Smoot amendment for a separate vote, and the question is whether or not we shall strike out section 7 as the committee reported it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not change his ruling, which was that nothing can occur in Committee of the Whole beyond reserving for a separate vote in the Senate whatever may have happened to be the vote in the Committee of the Whole. It happens to have been that the vote in the Committee of the Whole was on what is known as the Smoot amendment, which takes the place of the committee's suggestion, and that must be first voted on. If it is not concurred in in the Senate, then the vote recurs on the committee amendment to strike out the original text.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But suppose it is concurred in?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senate will have agreed to just what the Committee of the Whole agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Exactly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But even after the Smoot amendment was agreed to in the Committee of the Whole, the question then arose on the committee amendment, which struck out the entire section as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, no—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, Mr. President, if the Chair rules that it did not, I think I will have to appeal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I say that was the action taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows what took place, because the Chair was here. The Chair knows that the Senator from Utah submitted an amendment to the House text. That amendment was agreed to. Thereupon the Chair ruled that the question had to be put on the committee amendment to strike out. It was put and lost. So that the only thing that was reserved as in Committee of the Whole was what is known as the Smoot amendment. That was the only thing reserved for a vote in the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I did not reserve the Smoot amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] reserved it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I reserved the amendment of the committee striking out section 7. Of course if the Senator from Wisconsin reserved the other amendment, that is different; but I did not know that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not say that the Senator from North Carolina had reserved that amendment. This is clearly the parliamentary situation: The vote comes first on concurring in the Smoot amendment. If that is carried, that is the end of it; but if it is lost, then the vote recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, after it is concurred in and becomes a part of the House text, then surely we have the right in the Senate to vote upon the proposition to strike out the House text as amended.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what the Chair has stated.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the very thing I reserved—the amendment to strike out the original House provision. The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, adopted the Smoot amendment to the original text, and, the original text having been amended, then the question recurred upon the committee amendment to strike out section 7. If section 7 is stricken out in the Senate, then there is no need to vote on the Smoot amendment; but if it is not stricken out and the Smoot amendment was reserved we would have to vote on that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may be entirely wrong, and the question can easily be settled by an appeal, but the Chair rules that the vote is on concurring in the amendment made as in the Committee of the Whole, which was the substitution of what is known as the Smoot amendment for the original House text. If the Chair is wrong about that, it is easy for the Senate to settle it. The Chair has no pride of opinion about the matter.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Chair does not rule that we shall be deprived of an opportunity to vote on the committee amendment striking out section 7?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To what section 7 does the Senator from North Carolina refer?

Mr. OVERMAN. The last section of the bill, which the committee reported an amendment to strike out. That is what we have been talking about for almost a week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But what does the Senator from North Carolina mean—the House provision?

Mr. OVERMAN. I mean that section 7 came here from the House. If the Chair will examine the bill, he will see the lines stricken through the section. The committee recommended that that section be stricken from the bill. Before a vote was taken on that the Senator from Utah offered to amend the House text, and the House text was amended. Now, the amendment to strike out the whole section is still here.

Mr. SMOOT. That was disagreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. It was disagreed to, but I have reserved it for a separate vote in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator reserved it for a separate vote in the Senate, he is entitled to a vote; but the first vote comes on concurring in the Smoot amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is all right. I understood the Chair to say that when the Smoot amendment was acted upon, that would be the end of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What the Chair was trying to make clear was that it is the Smoot amendment we are about to vote upon.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is all right.

Mr. WEEKS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. On yesterday I offered an additional section, against which a point of order was made; and I reserved the right to offer it as an amendment to the Smoot amendment if that were concurred in. If the procedure is followed in accordance with the decision which the Chair has just made, will the amendment which I desire to offer to the Smoot amendment be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the custom which has prevailed since the present occupant of the Chair has been here, at this point it would be proper to offer an amendment to the Smoot amendment. It can be offered now.

Mr. WEEKS. If I do not see fit to offer it now, will it be in order to offer it after action has been taken on the Smoot amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not answer that, because the Chair does not know the language of the amendment; but when the Smoot amendment has been once agreed to as in Committee of the Whole and then concurred in in the Senate, without a reconsideration of the vote whereby it was concurred in, the Chair is afraid the Senator's amendment would not be in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to say that if it is offered after the Smoot amendment is voted on I shall object.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think that the objection will stand; but I will take my chance on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There must be no doubt about what the ruling of the Chair is. So that no Senator may fall into a

misapprehension, the Chair believes that if it is an amendment to the Smoot amendment it must be offered now, and that it can not be offered hereafter as an amendment to the Smoot amendment without a reconsideration of the vote whereby the Smoot amendment may be concurred in; but it may be offered as a separate amendment to the bill in the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment to section 7 agreed to as in Committee of the Whole on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, it will not be necessary to have a yeas-and-nays vote on that. I merely want a vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. If that be so, I will withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. OVERMAN. We do not want a yeas-and-nays vote on the Smoot amendment.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I had thought of offering an amendment to the Smoot amendment, but upon reflection I think perhaps that the matter that I wished to suggest can be taken care of better in conference than upon the floor of the Senate. I had in mind suggesting an increase of 20 per cent to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum of \$500 or less, 10 per cent to those who receive salaries of more than \$500 and not exceeding \$900, and 5 per cent to those receiving salaries between \$900 and \$1,800. I know that such an amendment would involve a great deal of discussion, and I have no disposition to delay materially the vote upon this bill. I desire to say a few words, however, to indicate why I think the Smoot amendment, at least, should be adopted.

The only fault I find with that amendment is that it does not go far enough. I am aware that I am not entirely in harmony with most of my colleagues on this side; but I can not adopt their reasoning upon this matter. I do not think it is fair to say that because we are living beyond our means therefore our hired help should suffer. I do not think that we are any more justified in denying proper advancement and compensation to Government employees, if such is deserved and needed, than a householder would be justified in refusing to compensate his hired girl because his family was living beyond his income. There have been measures before the Senate and before the other branch of Congress in connection with which millions and millions of dollars could have been saved, and we would not have been obliged to enter the plea that we could not afford to pay our help what they are entitled to receive.

It is said, among other things, that a horizontal raise is unscientific. Well, I do not think it is any more unscientific than the original method of fixing compensation by classes. If we originally fixed a class that would receive a compensation of \$500, another of \$700, another of \$900, another of \$1,200, another of \$1,400, and so on, why can we not horizontally raise the grades for the same reason that we originally fixed them? Not only that, but the manufacturing industries controlled and directed by men who know business, who are supposed to be and probably are the best business men we have in the country, have given their employees a horizontal raise. All the manufacturing establishments that have raised the wages or salaries of their employees have raised these wages or salaries horizontally 5 per cent, 10 per cent, 15 per cent, or 20 per cent; so that we are not out of harmony with the general practice, even in private business, in raising wages horizontally.

The plea that we can not afford to pay employees adequate wages does not come with good grace from a Government that can afford to pay its employees what they are worth. It is said that if you grant a horizontal increase you are giving some a raise who do not deserve it. I presume that all those receiving a thousand dollars a year in compensation do not give the same equivalent for their wage; yet as long as they are in the thousand-dollar class they are treated as though they gave the same equivalent. So if the compensation for the class is raised, even though there are some undeserving ones in the class, we would only be doing what we are already doing now in paying some more than they deserve who are in a certain class.

And why should we hesitate to give a raise to 90 per cent of the employees simply because 10 per cent might undeservedly get the raise? I do not think it is equity—to say that we must keep 90 per cent down because 10 per cent ought not to go up. I think we should give those who deserve it this raise, eliminate the others or put them in a lower class if we do not think they are earning the increased salary. Therefore I do not think that the argument that we should not raise the salaries of employees because a few are undeserving is sound.

Some make the plea that this Government should refuse to pay proper wages to its employees because we have already appropriated too much money. What does this mean? It is conceded that wages are too low. Anybody who lives in Washington knows that a thousand dollars a year does not go very far here. I had not been here very long until I discovered that. I am sure older Senators, who have been here considerably longer than I have, know how far they would get, or how far anyone can get, with a thousand dollars a year in the city of Washington. This is not the cheapest place in the world to live in, as I think everybody will acknowledge who has lived here for any length of time; and yet we have here people who are only getting three, four, or five hundred dollars a year, some who are drawing only six or seven hundred dollars a year—not enough to pay one month's rent for a house of any consequence. You can not rent a house of any consequence here in Washington for less than \$200 or \$250 a month, and the amount of rent ranges all the way up to a thousand dollars a month. So money is needed. It is needed just as badly by the employees of the United States as it is needed by the employees of great corporations throughout the country.

The employees need this increase, and they deserve it. They deserve to get a living wage. Shall the United States Government say that it knows these employees deserve this increase, that it knows they need it, but that the country can not afford to pay them? That would mean that we are withholding from a class of employees money to which they are entitled and which they deserve in order that we may put it into some other enterprise. In other words, we are saddling part of the burden of the Government upon those lower classes, and asking that they shall be deprived of a raise in their wages in order that we may spend the money to which they are justly entitled for other governmental purposes. In other words, we want to saddle the burdens of government upon our employees. I do not think that is generous, and I do not think that it is just.

This country is rich enough to pay its employees what they deserve. If we want economy, let us not economize at the bottom; let us economize at the top. There are bills coming in here for river and harbor improvements, for flood control, and other things of that kind that will carry appropriations running up into the hundreds of millions of dollars in the final analysis. Let us cut off a few millions from these bills if we are going to adopt them, or let us postpone these matters a few years if we do not want to abandon them, and let us pay the employees of the Government that which they are entitled to. Let us not appropriate all the money that we can, to the last dollar that we shall be able to raise here in this country, and then at the last moment say to our employees: "We have spent all the money we have, and therefore you will have to stand for it. This burden will have to rest on you alone."

I do not think the great Democratic Party ought to put itself in this attitude of withholding from the masses of the people a just wage. How can we, with consistency, call upon the great manufacturing establishments and transportation lines of this country to treat their employees justly, when we, by a poor and bad example, go the other way? Can we say with consistency to the railroads and the manufacturing establishments: "Here, you must not work your men more than eight hours a day; you must pay them a living wage, a minimum wage," when at the same time we are so preaching, we are practicing the other thing? If we deny a raise to these employees instead of going before the country with a good example, we can only go before the people with a good precept and a bad example.

The Democratic Party, especially, has been the champion of the working classes. I hope to see it continue to be such; but let it start at home. Let us treat these men and women justly who are working for the Government. Let us not talk about the flag, and tell them to love the flag, and love their country, when the country over which this flag flies treats them so niggardly. You can not get them to love a country if it does not show some love for them; and I say this Government, in dealing with its own employees, should set an example to the country of how employees should be treated, so that precept and example and practice will go hand in hand.

I hope sincerely that not only the Smoot amendment will be retained in this bill and be adopted but that the conferees of the House will insist upon the raise provided for in the House bill, so that the raise of wages will cover all those classes mentioned in the House bill. It is only just and fair, and I sincerely hope that the Senate will come to see the matter in this light.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now the question recurs on the committee amendment to strike out, reserved for a separate vote in the Senate.

Mr. BRYAN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). As I have already stated, I am paired with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). Has the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. In his absence, I will withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Has the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. HUSTING. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is paired with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and I therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]. He is not in the Chamber, and I must therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CATRON. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] and vote "nay."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am paired for the day with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay"; and I understand that if the Senator from Florida were here he would vote "yea."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Ashurst	Hughes	Randsdell	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	James	Reed	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Lewis	Saulsbury	Thomas
Bryan	Myers	Shafroth	Tillman
Culberson	Newlands	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hardwick	Overman	Shields	Walsh

NAYS—33.

Borah	Clapp	Husting	Lodge
Brady	Cummins	Kenyon	McCumber
Broussard	Curtis	Lane	Martine, N. J.
Catron	du Pont	Lee, Md.	Nelson
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Lippitt	Norris

Oliver	Pomerene	Thompson	Works
Page	Sherman	Warren	
Pittman	Smoot	Watson	
Polindexter	Sterling	Weeks	

NOT VOTING—39.

Brandegge	Gronna	Lea, Tenn.	Smith, Md.
Chilton	Harding	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Clark	Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Stone
Colt	Hollis	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Dillingham	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Swanson
Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Townsend
Fernald	Jones	Phelan	Underwood
Fletcher	Kern	Robinson	Wadsworth
Goff	Kirby	Simmons	Williams
Gore	La Follette	Smith, Ariz.	

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, after section 7, the following:

Provided, That from the date of the approval of this act and during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the increase of pay provided for in this section shall apply and be paid to the employees to whom the said section refers. The appropriation for this purpose shall be immediately available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish to make the same point of order that was made and sustained to this amendment when it was offered in Committee of the Whole. No estimate has been made for it; it adds a new item of appropriation; and it is an increase of an appropriation already made.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the proposition as it came from the House was general legislation. The point of order had been made against it in the House, and I understand it had stood. The proposition offered by the Senator from Utah, which has been adopted—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether he offers this as a separate amendment, or as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WEEKS. I offer it as an amendment to the amendment that has just been adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I must make the additional point of order that the right to do so was not reserved in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator is mistaken about that; I did reserve in Committee of the Whole the right to offer it in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already ruled on that proposition—that if it was an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, the point of order would be sustained by the Chair. If it is offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, the point of order is now sustained.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, just one observation. I did not offer the amendment to the Smoot amendment before the vote which was just taken, because I did not care to take the responsibility of jeopardizing that amendment, which I think is extremely important to the people who are to be benefited by the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Utah. I think as a result my amendment is now in a hopeless parliamentary situation, which I greatly regret. I can not understand Senators who are willing to vote, as the majority did vote in this Chamber last fall, to increase the pay of men who are receiving twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hundred dollars a year and yet are willing in times like these, when these people must be suffering, to refuse to raise their pay to take care of the conditions as they exist to-day.

This failure to do so, it seems to me, is a reflection upon the humanity of the Senate. We must know, every Senator must know, that these people are underpaid, or at least many of them are. What kind of citizens can we have or expect to have who are paid only \$480 under the living conditions of to-day? These are starvation wages; and the talk so frequently indulged in here about friendship for the laboring man is all leather and prunella when we refuse to raise the pay of people who are receiving starvation wages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still in the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that a motion?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 18453.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Arizona that he ask unanimous consent to again temporarily lay aside the unfinished business and take up the Indian appropriation bill. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is out of the Chamber.

Mr. ASHURST. I make that request, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has asked unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 2, line 7, after the words "Indian lands," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$105,000," and in line 17, after the date "nineteen hundred and fourteen," to insert "Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate and report to Congress his conclusions on the merits of the claim of the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon to additional land arising from alleged erroneous surveys of the north and west boundaries of their reservation as defined in the treaty concluded June 25, 1855 (12 Stat. L., 963). For the purpose of conducting this investigation the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such surveys or resurveys as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act," so as to make the clause read:

For the survey, resurvey, classification, and allotment of lands in severalty under the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. L., p. 388), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians," and under any other act or acts providing for the survey or allotment of Indian lands, \$105,000, to be repaid proportionally out of any Indian moneys held in trust or otherwise by the United States and available by law for such reimbursable purposes and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be used for the survey, resurvey, classification, or allotment of any land in severalty on the public domain to any Indian, whether of the Navajo or other tribes, within the State of New Mexico and the State of Arizona, who was not residing upon the public domain prior to June 30, 1914: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, etc., on page 3, line 18, after the date "1910," to strike out "\$235,000" and insert "\$240,300," so as to read:

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, purchase and use of irrigation tools and appliances, water rights, ditches, lands necessary for canals, pipe lines, and reservoirs for Indian reservations and allotments and for drainage and protection of irrigable lands from damage by floods, or loss of water rights, including expenses of necessary surveys and investigations to determine the feasibility and estimated cost of new projects and power and reservoir

sites on Indian reservations in accordance with the provisions of section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910, \$240,300, reimbursable as provided in the act of August 1, 1914, and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, etc., on page 4, line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$244,700" and insert "\$250,000," so as to read:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended on any irrigation system or reclamation project for which specific appropriation is made in this act or for which public funds are or may be available under any other act of Congress; for pay of one chief inspector of irrigation, who shall be a skilled irrigation engineer, \$4,000; one assistant inspector of irrigation, who shall be a skilled irrigation engineer, \$2,500; for traveling and incidental expenses of two inspectors of irrigation, including sleeping-car fare and a per diem of \$3 in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty in the field and away from designated headquarters, \$3,200; in all, \$250,000.

Mr. THOMAS. May I inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill why the appropriation of \$244,700 was increased by the committee to \$250,000?

Mr. ASHURST. The increase is \$5,300. The Committee on Indian Affairs believed from the statements made by the commissioner that that sum is adequate and proper and that the House did not appropriate a sufficient sum. It is \$50,000 less than the estimate. That is the only statement I have to make.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator of course knows the estimates are always large enough to cover possible contingencies. The fact that the estimate was \$300,000 on the face of it of course makes a prima facie case, but I think that the appropriation made by the House for the construction, repair, and maintenance of bridges, reservoirs, and dams is sufficient and the amendment of the committee increasing it to \$250,000 is more than enough. I object, therefore, to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask for a vote.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate amendment be not concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 13, after "\$150,000," to insert:

Provided, That automobiles or any other vehicles or conveyances used in introducing intoxicants into the Indian country in violation of law, whether used by the owner thereof or other person, shall be subject to the seizure, libel, and forfeiture provided in section 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

So as to make the clause read:

For the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians, \$150,000: *Provided*, That automobiles or any other vehicles or conveyances used in introducing intoxicants into the Indian country in violation of law, whether used by the owner thereof or other person, shall be subject to the seizure, libel, and forfeiture provided in section 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the relief and care of destitute Indians not provided for, etc., on page 4, line 24, after the word "sanatoria," to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$400,000"; so as to read:

For the relief and care of destitute Indians not otherwise provided for, and for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases, including transportation of patients to and from hospitals and sanatoria, \$400,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator in charge of the bill if this increase of \$50,000 is due to an increase in the sick roll among the Indians or the development of conditions which show that in previous years there was not enough money appropriated to take care of them?

Mr. ASHURST. In reply to the Senator from New York, I will state that the estimate of the department was the sum of \$400,000, and that within the past three or four years—I may say within the past six years—a very strenuous effort has been made to relieve the Indians from tuberculosis and trachoma, diseases with which they apparently seem to be peculiarly afflicted. In the judgment of the committee such excellent work has been done and so many of the tribes are being relieved from the ravages of these dread diseases that this seemed to be a most worthy and indeed a necessary appropriation, and we thought the whole sum of \$400,000 is necessary. A system of small hospitals, sometimes accommodating 15 or 20 patients, has been constructed throughout various portions of the United States, and that system is meeting with great success, far superior to that met by the large hospitals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the item of appropriation for the relief and care of destitute Indians not provided for, etc., on page 5, line 8, before the word "herein," to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$400,000," and in line 16, after the name "Oklahoma," to strike out "\$20,000; Fort Lapwai sana-

torium, Idaho, \$40,000; Laguna sanatorium, New Mexico, \$17,000; Mescalero hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Navajo sanatorium, New Mexico, \$10,000; Pima hospital, Arizona, \$10,000; Phoenix sanatorium, Arizona, \$40,000; Spokane hospital, Washington, \$10,000; Sac and Fox sanatorium, Iowa, \$30,000; Turtle Mountain hospital, North Dakota, \$10,000; Winnebago hospital, Nebraska, \$15,000; Crow Creek hospital, South Dakota, \$10,000; Hoopa Valley hospital, California, \$8,000; Jicarilla hospital, New Mexico, \$8,000; Truxton Canyon camp hospital, Arizona, \$8,000; Indian Oasis hospital, Arizona, \$8,000," and insert "\$30,000, \$5,000 of which shall be immediately available; Fort Lapwai sanatorium, Idaho, \$40,000; Laguna sanatorium, New Mexico, \$17,000; Mescalero hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Navajo sanatorium, New Mexico, \$10,000; Pima hospital, Arizona, \$10,000; Phoenix sanatorium, Arizona, \$40,000; Spokane hospital, Washington, \$10,000; Sac and Fox sanatorium, Iowa, \$30,000; Turtle Mountain hospital, North Dakota, \$10,000; Winnebago hospital, Nebraska, \$15,000; Crow Creek hospital, South Dakota, \$10,000; Hoopa Valley hospital, California, \$10,000; Jicarilla hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Truxton Canyon camp hospital, Arizona, \$8,000; Indian Oasis hospital, Arizona, \$10,000," so as to make the proviso read:

And provided further, That out of the appropriation of \$400,000 herein authorized, there shall be available for the maintenance of the sanatoria and hospitals hereinafter named, and for incidental and all other expenses for their proper conduct and management, including pay of employees, repairs, equipment, and improvements, not to exceed the following amounts: Blackfeet hospital, Montana, \$10,000; Carson hospital, Nevada, \$10,000; Cheyenne and Arapahoe hospital, Oklahoma, \$10,000; Choctaw and Chickasaw hospital, Oklahoma, \$30,000, \$5,000 of which shall be immediately available; Fort Lapwai sanatorium, Idaho, \$40,000; Laguna sanatorium, New Mexico, \$17,000; Mescalero hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Navajo sanatorium, New Mexico, \$10,000; Pima hospital, Arizona, \$10,000; Phoenix sanatorium, Arizona, \$40,000; Spokane hospital, Washington, \$10,000; Sac and Fox sanatorium, Iowa, \$30,000; Turtle Mountain hospital, North Dakota, \$10,000; Winnebago hospital, Nebraska, \$15,000; Crow Creek hospital, South Dakota, \$10,000; Hoopa Valley hospital, California, \$10,000; Jicarilla hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Truxton Canyon camp hospital, Arizona, \$8,000; Indian Oasis hospital, Arizona, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 17, after the word "therewith," to strike out "\$1,550,000" and insert "\$1,650,000," so as to read:

For support of Indian day and industrial schools not otherwise provided for, for other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith, \$1,650,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$40,000 of this amount may be used for the support and education of deaf and dumb or blind Indian children.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to strike out:

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, \$400,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service, who are furnished quarters, necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *Provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

And to insert:

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, \$625,000, of which at least \$200,000 shall be used for the construction of new schoolhouses: *Provided*, That of this amount \$300 may be expended for the purchase of a perpetual water right and right of way across the lands of private individuals, for the purpose of running a pipe line from a certain spring or springs located near the Sisseton Indian Agency buildings, South Dakota, to said buildings, the purchase of such water right to include sufficient land for the construction of a small cement reservoir near such spring or springs for the purpose of storing the water so acquired: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500 of the amount herein appropriated may be used for the acquisition on behalf of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, of land for a site for the Mesquakie Day School, Sac and Fox, Iowa: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of general construction work in the Indian Service, and that not to exceed two of such employees may be assigned to duty in the Indian Office from time to time when their services, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, are necessary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service who are furnished quarters necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *And provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amount for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senate committee has agreed upon an increase of \$225,000 over the appropriation made by the House for this purpose. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what the appropriation for this purpose was last year?

Mr. ASHURST. The appropriation for this same purpose last year amounted to \$400,000. I will try to explain as briefly as I may the origin and purpose of this raise.

During the discussion before the Committee on Indian Affairs it was developed that there are in the United States something over 17,000 Indian children without school facilities, there being in one State, to wit, the State of South Dakota, some 1,250, there being in the State of Arizona some 7,500 Indian children without school facilities, there being in the State of New Mexico some 3,500 without school facilities. This item and another item in the bill somewhat related to it were the subject of a vast deal of discussion, and the committee felt that the Government owed it, if not by treaty at least in morals, as an obligation to these various tribes, to give the Indian children the benefits of an education.

It would require an appropriation of about \$15,000,000 to provide ample school facilities for those Indian children who are not now equipped with school facilities. Manifestly the committee could not add \$15,000,000 in one bill and at one session of Congress, but the committee did think this would be a forward moving step, that it would be a very excellent starting point to make a gradual increase in the appropriations for school buildings.

Whether the state of the Public Treasury at this time will warrant the additional expenditure is a matter that must address itself to the sound discretion of each individual Senator, but nevertheless, the stubborn fact remains that there are some 17,000 Indian children at this time without adequate Government or other school facilities.

That explains the reason for this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator how many children of school age there are among the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. What is the question?

Mr. THOMAS. What is the approximate aggregate number of Indian children in the United States of school age?

Mr. ASHURST. Who are not provided for?

Mr. THOMAS. No; the total.

Mr. ASHURST. Who are in school?

Mr. CURTIS. There are about 40,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the Senator how long this lack of provision for the 17,000 children has existed?

Mr. ASHURST. It has always existed; that is, there have always been, I presume, a large number, ranging from ten or twelve to fifteen or sixteen thousand children of school age without school facilities.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course, there has always been a large number who had no school facilities.

Mr. THOMAS. I presume as long as we make appropriations there always will be, but I wish to ascertain whether this is an exigent situation or one which has been in existence for some time from year to year.

Mr. LANE. If the Senator will allow me, I will answer by saying that in nearly every treaty the Government made a solemn agreement with the Indians that they would furnish these schools, and they have not done it. In some cases the treaty is probably 50 or 60 years old, and the Government has failed to keep its pledge.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, Indian treaties, generally speaking, are kept only when it is necessary to make large appropriations for the purpose. We have expended, I think, in the last 20 years nearly \$250,000,000 from the Treasury for the purpose of educating and civilizing our Indian population, and they are hardly much more educated and civilized than when we began this system of appropriations. I believe that we should keep our treaty obligations, of course, and particularly with the helpless tribes of Indians; but as this does not seem to be a matter which has presented itself as an emergency between the time of the making of the last appropriation and the present time, I question the expediency of adding \$225,000 to this item now.

The Senator having the bill in charge suggests that whether in view of the condition of the Treasury we should do it now is for the Senate to determine. I think it is not only for the Senate to determine but also for the committee to have determined. I do not believe that the condition of the Treasury has much to do with our actions in making appropriations anywhere. The situation of the Treasury is a matter of after consideration. Some time ago a reported leak from the State Department resulted in a great sensation consequent upon the loss on Wall Street and in the other exchanges of the country of large sums of money by a lot of gamblers. The House is now, I believe, in the throes of an investigation, the purpose being to determine the origin of that leak. We have so many leaks from the Treasury, however, and so many men and women armed with drills and hammers engaged in the delectable work of

making as many more leaks as possible, it seems to be taken as a matter of course, it produces neither sensation nor an investigation. The leaks are so many and so numerous that the bottom of the Treasury now resembles a sieve or a watering pot more than anything else. I presume it will drop out very soon for lack of sufficient material in the bottom to hold the scattered pieces together.

Seriously, Mr. President, I do not believe at this time we should make these largely increased appropriations either in this or any other appropriation bill.

This bill as it comes to us from the House carries a total appropriation of \$10,625,956.67. The total appropriations by the committee are \$12,435,144.05, making a total increase of \$1,809,187.38. The decrease by the Senate committee is \$3,000, making a total net increase over the appropriations of the House of \$1,806,187.38. Of course, Mr. President, we know that a million dollars is of but little consequence in a modern Government appropriation bill. However, these constant accumulations amount to a good deal for the taxpayers of the country to bear in the end.

I shall therefore move to amend the amendment of the committee by striking out, beginning after the word "there-with," on line 3, page 8, "\$625,000, of which at least \$200,000 shall be used for the construction of new schoolhouses," and to insert in place thereof the figures "\$400,000," being the amount the House appropriated.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, like the Senator from Colorado, I believe in economy, and I think that the people at this time expect and deserve careful consideration to be given to the moneys that we expend. I am going to give the Senator an opportunity to put into force his argument in favor of economy. If the Senator will change his amendment to one striking out about every other item in the bill but this one he will save about eight or nine million dollars, and will have done an act of personal kindness and justice to the Indians. This is one of the valuable items.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator mean to strike out all other appropriations in the bill, whether made by the House or by the Senate committee?

Mr. LANE. It makes no difference who made them—all these general appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS. I want to understand the Senator. Does he mean all the amendments?

Mr. LANE. No; all the bill, with its eight or nine million dollars, practically none of which is for the benefit of the Indians. I am going to offer a substitute to cut them off, and I will give the reasons when I do so.

Mr. THOMAS. I want to assure the Senator that I will join him in that most heartily, particularly in view of the assertion he has just made that all these items of appropriation are of no benefit to the Indians.

Mr. LANE. They are not. It has been proven that a majority of them—I will not say all, but 99 per cent of them—are of no benefit to them.

But I want to state to the Senator that when he made the statement that we have appropriated, say, \$250,000,000 for the education of the Indians, a gratuity appropriation in the past, he forgot to mention that at the same time we have taken away from the Indians, absolutely deprived them of, probably \$250,000,000 worth of property and we owe them a debt in regard to the schools and it is long overdue.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I think it is a great deal more than that. It began with the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on Plymouth Rock.

Mr. LANE. Likely enough, but whatever else we did in the past we solemnly agreed to educate and erect a schoolhouse and furnish teachers for every 30 Indian children. We have done nothing of the kind. I think the obligation of the Government to the Indian children is greater than any other. I believe that one item is worthy of support and should be supported and the money should be appropriated. You can take this bill as a whole, however, and go through it and strike out item after item, amounting in all to millions of dollars, without harming the Indians and you will also save the money to the people.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator from Oregon whether his wholesale criticism of the appropriations contained in the bill are due to his conviction that the moneys thus provided for are diverted to other purposes?

Mr. LANE. They are not for the benefit of the Indians, but for the payment of salaries to the whites who manage the affairs of the Indians, with no benefit to the Indians whatever, as a rule, and many times with the loss of millions of dollars to them.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, let me ask the Senator whether the same fate does not await the amendment to which my amendment is directed?

Mr. LANE. I think the amendment ought to be amended so as to put the management of the Indian schools and other affairs in the hands of the Indians themselves.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt they would learn quite as much as they have learned or would be likely to learn under the civilizing and uplifting influences of the Indian management.

Mr. LANE. I think if the Senator from Colorado fully understood the conditions and had gone through them carefully, he would agree with me in my opinion about these matters.

Mr. THOMAS. I do agree with the Senator there.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record, without reading, a list containing the names of teachers, compensation allowed, location of schools, and the average attendance of all the Indian schools in the United States. This is taken from House Document No. 1457.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

List showing names of teachers, compensation allowed, location of school, and average attendance of each school, payable from "Indian schools, support, 1916."

School.	Location.	Average attendance.	Name of teacher.	Salary.						
					Pala day school.....	Pala.....	18	Agnes R. Wilhelm.....	600	
					Capitan Grande day school.....	Lakeside.....	13	Ora M. Salmons.....	900	
					La Jolla day school.....	Valley Center.....	10	Salvadora Valenzuela.....	300	
					Rincon day school.....	Rincon.....	10	Melvin D. Swain.....	720	
					Round Valley day school.....	Covelo.....	30	Ray R. Parrett.....	720	
					Upper Lake day school.....	Upper Lake.....	20	John F. Chambers.....	770	
					Ukiah day school.....	Ukiah.....	19	Adolph R. Stolz.....	720	
					Manchester day school.....	Manchester.....	6	Annie P. Gorman.....	600	
					Cahuilla day school.....	Cahuilla.....	10	Edwin Tabor.....	720	
					Mesa Grande day school.....	Mesa Grande.....	14	Eva L. Schnell.....	720	
					Volcan day school.....	Santa Ysabel.....	15	Minnie Tillson.....	600	
					Tule River day school.....	do.....	16	Emily C. Shawk.....	750	
					Auberry day school.....	Auberry.....	19	Thomas M. Games.....	720	
					Burrough day school.....	Burrough.....	20	Vacant.....	630	
								Lydia Spicer Fiesse.....	780	
								Frank E. Brennan.....	720	
								Edmund J. Bryant.....	720	
ARIZONA.					COLORADO.					
Camp McDowell day school.....	McDowell.....	27	Hans B. Klingenberg.....	\$720	Ute Mountain day school.....	Towaoc.....	20	Elizabeth L. Smith.....	600	
Salt River day school.....	Scottsdale.....	52	William L. Johnson.....	840	Southern Ute boarding school.....	Ignacio.....	58	Albert B. Reagan (principal).....	840	
Lehigh day school.....	Mesa.....	20	Donie H. Dutton.....	690	Allen day school.....	do.....	14	Ottilla A. Reagan.....	600	
Camp Verde day school.....	Camp Verde.....	22	Edward E. Palmer.....	795				Joseph D. Turner.....	810	
Clarksdale day school.....	Clarksdale.....	25	Vacant.....	720				Vacant (principal).....	1,400	
Colorado River boarding school.....	Parker.....	85	George W. Might.....	720	Fort Hall boarding school.....	Fort Hall.....	126	Jessie M. Pinkerton.....	600	
			Edward E. Horn.....	810				Grace M. Jackson (kindergarten).....	600	
			Callie M. Graham.....	630	Kamiah day school.....	Kamiah.....	13	Nellie S. Guyer.....	780	
			Vacant.....	720	Kootenai day school.....	Bonniers Ferry.....	27	Merritt S. Fisher.....	720	
			Sylvia Worstell.....	600	IOWA.					
Fort Apache boarding school.....	Whiteriver.....	205	Malcolm G. Vernon.....	600	Fox day school.....	Toledo.....	19	Carl Stevens.....	750	
			Nellie M. Unger.....	600	Mesquakie day school.....	Tama.....	21	Nellie M. Sherwood.....	780	
			Ernest R. McCray (principal).....	1,000	Sac and Fox Sanatorium.....	Toledo.....	57	Etta J. Snell.....	600	
					KANSAS.					
Cibecue day school.....	do.....	25	John B. Peters.....	780	Great Nemaha day school.....	White Cloud.....	10	Mary I. Dupuis.....	600	
Canyon day school.....	Fort Apache.....	30	Vacant.....	720	MINNESOTA.					
East Fork day school.....	Whiteriver.....	38	Ward C. Cramer.....	775	Birch Cooley day school.....	Morton.....	12	Robert H. C. Hinman.....	720	
Havasupai day school.....	Supai.....	22	Vacant.....	720	MICHIGAN.					
Kalbab day school.....	Moccasini.....	12	Mabel C. Crosby.....	720	Bay Mills day school.....	Bay Mills.....	21	Chester C. Pidgeon.....	1,000	
Leupp boarding school.....	Leupp.....	65	Anna Sheridan.....	780	MONTANA.					
			Vacant.....	690	Fort Belknap boarding school.....	Harlem.....	61	John W. Lydy (principal).....	1,300	
			do.....	900	Lodge Pole day school.....	Lodgepole.....	18	Alta R. M. Lenardson.....	660	
Moqui boarding school.....	Keams Canon.....		do.....	630	Milk River day school.....	Harlem.....		Clara I. Goodfellow.....	745	
Chimopovy day school.....	Toreva.....	34	James W. Buchanan.....	840				Vacant.....	600	
			John W. Drummond (principal).....	1,000				Edward J. Peacore (principal).....	1,200	
Polacca day school.....	Polacca.....	99	Lena Langford.....	720	Fort Peck boarding school.....	Poplar.....	90	Mary B. McDougal.....	600	
			Vacant.....	630				Elizabeth Stratton (kindergarten).....	660	
			do.....	600	Fort Peck day school No. 1.....	Culbertson.....	15	David A. Hiebert.....	720	
Second Mesa day school.....	Toreva.....	67	George L. Learning (principal).....	1,000	Fort Peck day school No. 2.....	Brockton.....	16	Sarah A. Myers.....	720	
			Ethel D. Platz.....	600	Fort Peck day school No. 3.....	Oswego.....	12	Walter Riesbol.....	720	
Oraibi day school.....	Oraibi.....	67	Ruby Seaver.....	600	Fort Peck day school No. 4.....	do.....	22	Reid B. Winnie.....	720	
			Vacant (principal).....	1,000				Maurice W. Cooper (principal).....	1,000	
			Grace Griffith.....	600				William D. Kingsley.....	600	
			Zoe H. Bailey.....	600				Fern D. Davis.....	630	
			Emory A. Marks (principal).....	1,000				Ralf E. Cherrick.....	750	
Hotevilla-Bacabi day school.....	do.....	31	Vacant.....	600				Elizabeth M. Cherrick.....	630	
			Carrie E. Fenton.....	600				John B. Batson.....	700	
			Mamie Dauberman.....	600				Marion C. Olmsted (principal).....	1,000	
Navajo boarding school.....	Fort Defiance.....	132	Sadie E. Evans.....	810				J. Edwin Levings.....	720	
			Christine Spreier.....	600				Ruth A. McNulty.....	600	
			Jennie O'Connor.....	630				Joseph S. Krzykwa.....	600	
			Maude McCafferty.....	600				Wesley D. Helm.....	600	
			Joseph A. Garbar (principal).....	1,200				Alden J. Van Campen.....	600	
Chin Lee boarding school.....	Chin Lee.....	105	Stella E. Laughlin.....	690						
			America J. Secombe (kindergarten).....	630						
			William J. Wells.....	600						
Luki Chuki day school.....	Gallup.....	14	Ralph S. Hicks.....	840						
			Myrtle E. Hicks.....	600						
			John E. Wetenhall.....	1,000						
Tohatchi boarding school.....	Tohatchi.....	145	Vacant.....	600						
			do.....	660						
			Ethel M. McConnell.....	600						
Cornfields day school.....	Cornfields.....	21	Ella Burton.....	840						
			Taylor P. Gabbard.....	1,200						
Pima boarding school.....	Sacaton.....	222	Cora M. Hall.....	720						
			Zena R. Monroe.....	600						
			Mary E. McNair.....	600						
			Dorothy Schellhase.....	660						
Maricopa day school.....	Phoenix.....	36	Jean O. Barnd.....	795						
Gila Crossing day school.....	do.....	33	Sam S. Essary.....	795						
Casa Blanca day school.....	Sacaton.....	46	Martin R. Chadick.....	720						
Blackwater day school.....	Blackwater.....	30	Edna L. Plake.....	770						
Pima Agency day school.....	Sacaton.....	22	Wilma Love.....	720						

List showing names of teachers, compensation allowed, etc.—Continued.

School.	Location.	Average attendance.	Name of teacher.	Salary.
NEVADA.				
Fallon day school.	Fallon.	11	Margaret A. Bingham.	\$745
Lovelocks day school.	Lovelocks.	14	Vacant.	720
Fort McDermitt day school.	McDermitt.	47	George H. Beaman.	745
			Della Beaman (kindergarten).	600
Mospa River day school.	Mospa.	13	H. Lorraine Hess.	780
			Elizabeth A. James.	690
Nevada boarding school.	Wadsworth.	64	Anna Rintelman (kindergarten).	630
Wadsworth day school.	do.	13	Vacant.	600
Walker River day school.	Schurz.	24	Hattie W. Hazen.	720
Western Shoshone day school.	Owyhee.	21	Leonidas Swalm.	840
Western Shoshone day school No. 2.	do.	21	William H. Pfeiffer.	840
Western Shoshone day school No. 3.	do.		Vacant.	840
NEW MEXICO.				
Jicarilla boarding school.	Dulce.	103	Paul A. Walter.	1,000
			Josephine R. Walter.	730
			Louise B. Thompson.	600
			Katherine Ferguson.	600
			Vacant.	720
Mescalero boarding school.	Mescalero.	88	Amelia B. Thomas (kindergarten).	720
Acoma day school.	Cubero.	38	Otilia Kessel.	720
Encinal day school.	do.	18	James C. Waters.	745
			Maudie E. Marshall.	600
Isleta day school.	Isleta.	98	Vacant.	720
			Grace Wyland.	600
Laguna day school.	Laguna.	39	Agnes A. Morrow.	720
Mesita day school.	do.	28	James G. Wilds.	720
Paguate day school.	do.	64	Samuel E. Beahm.	720
			Estelle M. Beahm.	600
Paraje day school.	Casa Blanca.	29	Fred W. Canfield.	720
San Felipe day school.	Algodones.	45	Paul D. J. Dennis.	840
Seama day school.	Seama.	30	Emma Dawson.	840
McCart's day school.	Laguna.	24	Alma H. Poole.	600
Cochiti day school.	Pena Blanca.	18	Nettie Cook.	775
Jemez day school.	Jemez.	59	Mary M. Boyle.	680
			Mary Stephanie Schramme.	690
			Olive I. Davis.	600
			Hattie E. Drake.	720
Pueblo Bonito boarding school.	Crownpoint.	133	Robert E. Johnson, principal.	1,100
			Katherine R. Walters.	600
Placitas day school.	Dixon.	19	Walter L. Bolander.	720
San Ildefonso day school.	Ildefonso.	14	Lucy I. Balfe.	745
Santa Dominga day school.	Domingo.	57	Mary E. Dissette.	840
San Juan day school.	Chamita.	38	Mrs. Henry H. Kramer.	840
			Ruth Ferguson.	625
Santa Clara day school.	Espanola.	27	Robert J. Warfield.	720
Taos day school.	Taos.	61	Alice G. Dwyer.	840
Sia day school.	Sia.	14	Nellie N. Peery.	500
Day school inspector.	Albuquerque.		Benjamin S. Bothwell.	720
			Ernest H. Hammond.	1,400
San Juan boarding school.	Shiprock.	179	Emma Lomas.	900
			Vacant.	720
			Nellie Milam.	600
			William J. Davis, principal.	900
Aneth boarding school.	Aneth.		Mary E. Smith.	720
Toadale day school.	Crozier.		William L. Johnson.	840
			Chester B. Risher.	600
Zuni boarding school.	Blackrock.	113	Minnie L. Etzweiler.	600
			Vacant.	600
			Glenn E. Isaacs, principal.	900
			Lovey L. Hunsinger.	600
Zuni day school.	do.	130	Grace V. Haas.	600
			Mary Teter.	600
NORTH CAROLINA.				
Birdtown day school.	Birdtown.	16	Fernando G. Tranbarger.	720
Snowbird Gap day school.	Robbinsville.	12	John A. Hyde.	270
Little Snowbird day school.	Andrews.	9	J. Fowler Hyde.	270
Big Cove day school.	Swaney.	10	Mary W. Thompson.	270
NORTH DAKOTA.				
Fort Berthold boarding school.	Elbowoods.	41	Paul Lotter, principal.	840
			Rossana Ruffner.	540
Fort Berthold day school No. 1.	do.	12	Jessamine E. Hodgson.	480
Fort Berthold day school No. 2.	do.	18	Lee E. Osgood.	625
Fort Berthold day school No. 3.	do.	20	Lewis W. Page.	750
Turtle Mountain day school No. 1.	Belcourt.	31	Chas. W. Hoffman.	750
Turtle Mountain day school No. 2.	do.	26	Theodore J. Klaus.	745
Turtle Mountain day school No. 3.	do.	26	Wellington Salt.	745
Turtle Mountain day school No. 4.	Laureat.	16	R. N. Clark.	745
Turtle Mountain day school No. 5.	Belcourt.	35	Earl R. Hall.	745
Turtle Mountain day school No. 6.	Dunseith.	12	Norris D. Richey.	745

List showing names of teachers, compensation allowed, etc.—Continued.

School.	Location.	Average attendance.	Name of teacher.	Salary.
OKLAHOMA.				
Cantonment boarding school.	Cantonment.	74	Lucius C. Gibson.	\$840
			Luelle J. Harwood.	600
			Jennie C. Brown.	600
			J. E. Shields (principal).	1,100
Chayenne and Arapaho school.	Darlington.	128	Jerdine Bonnin.	780
			Anna Brace Bowman.	690
			Dorothy Hudgins (kindergarten).	750
Fort Sill boarding school.	Lawton.	170	Charles Eggers (principal).	1,300
			Eva Eggers.	600
			Tollie Pfister.	600
			Nellie M. Mooney.	630
			Roger W. Bishoff (principal).	1,200
Rainy Mountain boarding school.	Gotebo.	141	Flora A. De Lay.	750
			Iva L. Burdick.	600
			Isabel J. MacRoy (kindergarten).	600
			J. G. Pressly (principal).	1,200
Riverside boarding school.	Anadarko.	105	Marcia K. Sherry.	600
			George Buckland.	720
			Vacant.	600
Anadarko boarding school.	Mount Scott.	124	Isadore Ricklin (principal).	1,000
			Nettie Taylor.	530
			Annie Dietz (kindergarten).	530
			Vacant.	540
Kiowa Agency.	Anadarko.		Jesse W. Smith (supervising principal).	1,200
Ponca boarding school.	Whiteagle.	93	James H. Odle (principal).	900
			Paph Julian.	720
Red Moon school.	Hammon.	21	Helen M. Colville (kindergarten).	690
Seeger boarding school.	Colony.	84	Mattie Ewing Pruitt.	600
			Dora Porterfield.	810
			Louise Strange (kindergarten).	720
Seneca boarding school.	Wyandotte.	125	William H. Ross (principal).	900
			David W. Gilliland (principal).	900
			Clara D. Allen.	810
			Naomi Pacheco (kindergarten).	600
			Roxanna Smith.	600
			Gertrude Lobdell.	600
			Inez Hudson.	600
Shawnee boarding school.	Shawnee.	97	Blanche A. Giltner (kindergarten).	630
			Fred M. Lobdell (principal).	900
Pawnee boarding school.	Pawnee.	73	Joseph E. Mountford (principal).	1,000
Sac and Fox boarding school.	Stroud.	60	Robert E. Manion (principal).	900
OREGON.				
Klamath boarding school.	Klamath Agency.	74	William H. Haebarger.	900
			Clyde B. Miller.	660
Modoc Point day school.	do.	11	Helena B. Farrand.	720
Yainax day school.	Bonanza.	12	Ross J. Ferguson.	780
Klamath day school No. 1.	Chiloquin.	17	John L. Richards.	720
Klamath day school No. 2.	Yainax.	7	Fannie H. Delzell.	810
Klamath day school No. 3.	Paints Camp.	14	Leslie J. Risley.	780
Siletz day school.	Siletz.	28	Henry F. Markistum.	720
Upper Farm day school.	do.	11	Arendia G. Eldridge.	720
			Robert R. De Boe.	780
Warm Springs school.	Warm Springs.	94	Walter E. Baker (principal).	900
			Ella Baker.	690
Sinnasho day school.	Sinnasho.	13	Ransom C. Boecklewick.	720
SOUTH DAKOTA.				
Springfield boarding school.	Springfield.	57	Josephine A. Hilton.	660
Yankton boarding school.	Wagner.	78	Edith A. Kennon.	690
			Ada C. Bush (kindergarten).	600
			John F. Thompson (principal).	900
UTAH.				
Goshute day school.	Ibapah.	32	Amos R. Frank (superintendent).	1,000
Shivwits day school.	Santa Clara.	15	Elizabeth M. Molineux.	720
Skull Valley day school.	Iosepa.	10	William J. Merz.	840
WASHINGTON.				
Colville day school No. 1.	Covoda.	13	Vacant.	720
Colville day school No. 3.	Nespelem.	27	George E. Peters.	780
Colville day school No. 4.	Daisy.	23	Victor H. Johnson.	720
Colville day school No. 5.	Nespelem.	22	Otis Melon.	780
Colville day school No. 6.	Daisy.	16	Oscar Swindle.	720
Colville day school No. 7.	Jerome.	3	Elvin W. Heninger.	720
Colville day school No. 9.	Keller.	21	George Houser.	750
Skokomish day school.	Union.	15	Henry F. Lenz.	840
Queets day school.	Taholah.	12	Chester A. Ballard.	840
Taholah day school.	do.	44	John H. Hulett.	840
Neah Bay day school.	Neah Bay.	55	George A. Shum.	750
			Gladie M. Simms.	600

List showing names of teachers, compensation allowed, etc.—Continued.

School.	Location.	Average attendance.	Name of teacher.	Salary.
WASHINGTON—continued.				
Quileute day school.....	La Push.....	43	Fred D. Keene.....	\$780
Spokane day school No. 1.	Lott.....	17	Edyth Keene.....	690
Spokane day school No. 2.	Chamokane.....	21	Frank B. Allison.....	750
Spokane day school No. 8.	Springdale.....	11	Harry C. Norman.....	780
			Roger Gorman.....	720
			William N. Sickles (principal).....	1,200
Tulalip boarding school.	Tulalip.....	149	Mary Prall.....	720
			Nina M. Hurlburt.....	690
			Francis M. B. Emerson.....	600
			Esther L. Newlove.....	600
Swinomish day school.....	La Conner.....	15	Lucy A. Case.....	720
Lummi day school.....	Marietta.....	14	Mary Moores.....	720
Port Gamble day school.....	Port Gamble.....	19	August Harman.....	840
Jamestown day school.....	Dungeness.....	12	Archie M. Taylor.....	840
			George B. Haggett (principal).....	1,200
Yakima boarding school..	Fort Simcoe.....	120	Isabelle B. Haggett.....	720
			Mellie E. Dohse.....	660
			Mary L. Leader.....	540
			Charles E. Inman.....	720
Kalispell day school.....	Cusick.....			
WISCONSIN.				
Lac Courte Oreille day school.	Reserve.....	37	Xavier Grany.....	625
			Agnes Rietz.....	475
Lac du Flambeau boarding school.	Lac du Flambeau.....	125	Allace S. White.....	630
			Bessie Peters.....	600
			Nora Grimstad.....	600
			Lucy P. Hart.....	720
Oneida boarding school...	Oneida.....	149	Cleo List.....	600
			Alice Cornelius.....	660
			Lena Ludwick.....	600
Red Cliff day school.....	Bayfield.....	26	Seraphica Reineck.....	675
Wittenberg boarding school.	Wittenberg.....	120	Martina Cleveland.....	810
			Esther A. Gunderson.....	750
			Myrtle A. Eickhoff.....	630
WYOMING.				
Arapahoe day school.....	Arapahoe.....	22	Robert H. Knox.....	720

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 9, line 15, after the word "employment," to insert:

Provided further, That where practicable the transportation and expenses so paid shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid and be available for reexpenditure.

So as to make the clause read:

For collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools, and for placing school pupils, with the consent of their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, industrial, and educational training, \$72,000: *Provided,* That not exceeding \$5,000 of this sum may be used for obtaining remunerative employment for Indian youths and, when necessary, for payment of transportation and other expenses to their places of employment: *Provided further,* That where practicable the transportation and expenses so paid shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid and be available for reexpenditure. The provisions of this section shall also apply to native Indian pupils of school age under 21 years of age brought from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the item of appropriation for the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, etc., on page 19, line 11, after the word "Indians," to strike out "\$425,000" and insert "\$500,000," so as to read:

For the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, and to educate Indians in the proper care of forests; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, for necessary traveling expenses of such matrons, and for furnishing necessary equipments and supplies and renting quarters for them where necessary; for the conducting of experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, cotton, and fruits, and for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen, in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; for necessary traveling expenses of such farmers and stockmen and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies for them; and for superintending and directing farming and stock raising among Indians, \$500,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to make one more effort to reduce these appropriations. I trust that the Senate committee amendment which has just been stated will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I shall occupy but a moment, as I do not desire to take up the time of the Senate. The amount of the estimates for this item was \$500,000. This appropriation is for what might be called an industrial item. It is regarded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as one of the worthy items to be used for the purpose of training and teaching an Indian how to make a white man of himself. If the Senator from Colorado, however, thinks that the sum of \$500,000 is too much, I hope he will not object to a slight increase of the appropriation. If the Senator finds himself unable to vote for the whole sum, why not let us have an increase, say, to \$450,000? I think this is a worthy item, and I think the hearings which were held before the committee disclosed that the sum proposed to be appropriated will not be frittered away, but that the present appropriation for the same purpose is being used rather jealously and in a proper way.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, of course I am not impugning the good faith of the chairman of the committee. I know he thinks that all of these are worthy items, or he would not have presented them here. I am also aware that the purpose of this increase is as stated. Let us read it and see what it is. It is as follows:

For the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments and to educate Indians in the proper care of forests; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, for necessary traveling expenses of such matrons; and for furnishing necessary equipments and supplies and renting quarters for them where necessary; for the conducting of experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, cotton, and fruits, and for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen, in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; for necessary traveling expenses of such farmers and stockmen and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies for them; and for superintending and directing farming and stock raising among Indians.

Mr. ASHURST. If the distinguished Senator will yield to me a moment, I desire to suggest that he will be able to see upon reading the hearings that this is supposed to be, that it is intended to be, and I wish to assert that it is, for the specific benefit of the Indians in training them for industrial life. I hope, therefore, the Senator will withdraw his opposition and will let the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt it will be agreed to, whether I withdraw my opposition or not.

Mr. ASHURST. Would the Senator be content to let the amendment be agreed to appropriating \$450,000?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I do not care to split the difference, Mr. President. If my objection is sound, it should be sustained; and if it is not sound, it ought not to be compromised.

The Senator from Arizona suggests that the purpose of this appropriation is to make a white man out of an Indian. Well, Mr. President, if the surplus in the Treasury was equivalent to the threatened deficiency I do not believe it would accomplish that. This appropriation has a most familiar sound. It has been in all the appropriation bills for the past four years and the Indians seem to know no more about preserving living and growing timber on their reservations now than when these appropriations began, and I think that when it comes to educating Indians in the proper care of forests the probabilities are that they could teach their teachers much more capably than the teachers would be expected to educate them.

There is no question, Mr. President, about the humane purpose involved in this and in other similar appropriations. What I object to is their increase at this time when we are obliged, if we will exercise the commonest elements of business prudence, to live within our income. Instead of doing that, Mr. President, I observe no tendency in that direction upon either side of the Chamber. Senators talk in favor of economy and in favor of retrenchment, but, as I said the other day, it is impossible to pick the place to begin.

The thoughtless appropriations which we make here are the cause of our present financial embarrassment. We are going ahead, all oblivious of the time when pay day shall arrive and when we must either confess our inability to meet our obligations or go further into debt by the issuance of bonds. I am opposed to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, in the item of appropriation for the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, etc., on page 11, line 6, after the word "appropriated," to strike out "shall" and insert "may," and in line 10, after

the word "stockmen," to strike out "herein provided for," so as to read:

And provided further, That not to exceed \$25,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be used to conduct experiments on Indian school or agency farms to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, cotton, grains, vegetables, and fruits: *Provided, also*, That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, physicians, and stockmen shall not be included within the limitation on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 20, before the word "warehouse," to strike out "two" and insert "three," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase of goods and supplies for the Indian Service, including inspection, pay of necessary employees, and all other expenses connected therewith, including advertising, storage, and transportation of Indian goods and supplies, \$300,000: *Provided*, That no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be used for the maintenance of to exceed three warehouses in the Indian Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 15, after the word "exist," to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of judges of Indian courts where tribal relations now exist, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 1, after "\$135,000," to insert: "*Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of this amount shall be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of special agents, at \$2,000 per annum; for traveling and incidental expenses of such special agents, including sleeping-car fare, and a per diem of not to exceed \$3 in lieu of subsistence, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, when actually employed on duty in the field or ordered to the seat of government; for transportation and incidental expenses of officers and clerks of the Office of Indian Affairs when traveling on official duty; for pay of employees not otherwise provided for; and for other necessary expenses of the Indian Service for which no other appropriation is available, \$135,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of this amount shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 22, after the word "crops," to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$450,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians and to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops, \$450,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, which sum may be used for the purchase of seed, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable Indians to become self-supporting: *Provided*, That said sum shall be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1925: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended on any one reservation or for the benefit of any one tribe of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 10, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$300,000," so as to make the clause read:

That not to exceed \$300,000 of applicable appropriations made herein for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of superintendents, farmers, physicians, field matrons, allotting, irrigation, and other employees in the Indian field service.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. President, we come to an increased appropriation of \$100,000.

For the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of superintendents, farmers, physicians, field matrons, allotting, irrigation, and other employees in the Indian field service.

The House appropriated the sum of \$200,000 for that purpose. Let me ask the chairman of the committee—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, this is not an appropriation; this is simply an authorization on the part of the department to use a certain sum already appropriated, or appropriated in this bill, for a specific purpose, to wit, the repair and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles. It authorizes the utilization of a certain appropriated sum for this purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the fact is that the effect of the Senate committee amendment is to allow the expenditure of \$100,000 more than the House provided "of applicable appropriations" for motor-propelled and other vehicles. Now, let me ask the Senator if that can not be dispensed with at present?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in reply to the very able Senator, I will read from page 8 of the report of the committee as to this item:

PURCHASE OF VEHICLES FOR INDIAN SERVICE.

No appropriation is carried in this paragraph, and it is necessary because section 5 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropri-

tion act for 1915 prohibited the bureaus of the Government from purchasing passenger-carrying vehicles without first obtaining permission and authority of Congress. (See 38 Stat. L., p. 508.) It is now more expensive to maintain vehicles and provide feed for animals than in former years, consequently \$300,000 is allowed instead of \$200,000, as was granted last year, and the Secretary is granted authority "to exchange automobiles in part payment for new machines used for the same purpose as those proposed to be exchanged." A number of automobiles have been in service for a long time, and it is more expensive to keep them in operation than to exchange them and buy cheaper and lighter machines. In the current law \$50,000 instead of \$30,000 is allowed this year for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, as there are not a sufficient number of machines to provide for the physicians, matrons, and superintendents.

Mr. THOMAS. In other words, Mr. President, the superintendents, the farmers, the physicians, the field matrons, and the other paraphernalia of employees whose business it will be to expend these appropriations, are to be given \$100,000 more this year for automobiles and other vehicles than was allowed last year, upon the theory that the cost of living is higher now than it was then.

This is the last objection that I am going to make to this bill. If the Senate sees fit to vote for this amendment under existing conditions, which I have reiterated here so often that I have no doubt it accounts largely for the empty seats that I see before me, I am through, so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I think the Senate is entitled to the following information. I read from page 92 of the House hearings:

During the fiscal year 1915-16 the Indian Service, by reason of legislation by Congress, was prohibited from purchasing any form of passenger-carrying vehicles. There were on hand in the Indian Service at that time 118 automobiles and 739 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, as reported to Congress, for the use of approximately 6,000 employees. By the appropriation act for the present fiscal year we were permitted to expend not to exceed \$30,000 of the total amount available in the act for the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles, and \$15,000 for the purchase of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles. With these sums there have been purchased 70 automobiles and 112 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles.

These vehicles are used in conveying children to and from school and in transporting physicians and matrons over the reservation. That is all I care to say about it.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I should like to say that this item has some merit in it. I think it could be trimmed; but there is actual need for the use of some of these vehicles. I think the Senator from Colorado will agree with me that a physician located in the middle of a reservation, perhaps 20 or 30 or 40 miles from its borders, when called to attend emergency cases and respond to calls coming at the same time from different directions, particularly in cases of childbirth, should have an automobile. Women have died for lack of proper medical attendance upon the reservations in such cases; some within the last year, I have been informed. It is cruel and wrong not to provide for a proper conveyance in such cases. The physician should be given a Ford or some cheap machine, and the matrons should also have some means of transportation. The superintendents are required to go over the reservations, and they are entitled to conveyances to take them about, though perhaps they would not make as much use of them for that purpose as they ought to do. The farmers do not need them so badly, but there is an actual need for these vehicles in some instances, and the item is a worthy expenditure to that extent.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I would not intrude into this discussion at all were it not for the threat just made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], that unless some attention was paid to his objections as to this particular item he might retire from the Chamber altogether and leave this particular bill to the tender mercies of its friends.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I was not aware that I had threatened the Senate at all; I did not intend to do that. I merely wished to express my conviction that further objections were useless, since it appears that, as the legislative bill was no place for economy to begin, neither is the Indian appropriation bill any place for economy to begin. So I concluded, after this amendment, that I would retire, not from the Senate Chamber but from the position of objector, and wait until the next appropriation bill came up, to see whether I could discover that mysterious thing that seems to be nonexistent—a place for economy to begin.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I hope the Senator from Colorado will not leave the Chamber. I think his statements are very frank and

manly, and I hope he will not desist from making objections merely because they happen to be overruled.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I will take the liberty of saying to the Senator from Colorado that if he is going to play the rôle of a saver of public money, he must not be so easily discouraged. I have acted in that capacity on a number of occasions and devoted a good deal of time to trying to save the public money. The Senator will encounter a great many disappointments and a great deal of discouragement; but one of the first things he must learn is to distinguish between authorizations and actual appropriations of money.

As I understand the facts with reference to this item, the money has already been appropriated; it is available; and every penny of it can be spent for horses and wagons.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I understand the distinction, of course, between appropriations and authorizations. I also fully understood the statement of the chairman of the committee that this was a provision for the expenditure of an appropriation previously made; but why should we increase an appropriation previously made beyond the amount which has been expended in past years, there being no emergency that I have yet been able to perceive for the increase?

Mr. HUGHES. I think I can explain that to the Senator. I did not think he understood it. As the law now stands, this money would have to be spent for horses and wagons. They could spend it all for horses and wagons, but there is a statute which prevents them from spending it for automobiles. They would rather have automobiles than horses and wagons. Automobiles are more economical than horses and wagons.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will look at the amendment, it provides for the expenditure of this money for horse-drawn vehicles as well as for motor-propelled vehicles; and, as I understand it, this amendment is necessary if any part of this money is to be expended either for horse-drawn vehicles or for automobiles.

Mr. HUGHES. I think not. It is only necessary—

Mr. THOMAS. Not to exceed \$15,000 is to be used for the purchase of horse-drawn vehicles and not to exceed \$50,000 for the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a statute which would prevent them. As the law now stands they could not spend this money for motor-operated vehicles, because at one time in a spasm of virtue, of so-called economy, Congress rose in its wrath and said that certain gentlemen were riding around in automobiles who ought not to be riding around in automobiles, and solemnly enacted into law a restriction upon various officers of the Government and various departments of the Government which operated to prevent them from purchasing automobiles.

Mr. THOMAS. I fully agree with the Senator that if the expenditure is to be made, the automobile is the better vehicle.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the only thing we are deciding here. We are giving them authority which this official says he ought to have because of the cheaper operation of automobiles.

Mr. THOMAS. But while the money which is to be expended under this provision will be ostensibly used for the purposes recited in the amendment, as stated by the Senator from Oregon, like the other appropriations, the chances are that it will be diverted from its real purpose and expended in other directions.

Mr. HUGHES. I hope the Senator will stay and continue the scrutiny of these items, for if he is diligent and faithful in the performance of that duty, he will probably save the people of the United States \$150,000 or \$200,000 this afternoon. Surely that is worth while.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I doubt it. I do not believe that.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator refused to accept the compromise of \$50,000 awhile ago, and I simply shuddered at the nonchalance with which he waved away the offer of the chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. I refused to accept it, but that did not prevent the chairman of the committee from suggesting to the Senate the substitution of the sum mentioned by him in place of that which the bill then contained.

Mr. HUGHES. The chairman will not do that now.

Mr. THOMAS. I still say that if my objection was good, it was good in toto. If it was not good, it should not have prevailed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was on page 14, line 18, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to read:

Provided, That not to exceed \$15,000 may be used in the purchase of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed \$50,000

for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and that such vehicles shall be used only for official service: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior may hereafter exchange automobiles in part payment for new machines used for the same purpose as those proposed to be exchanged.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 6, after the word "prescribe," to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$100,000, said amount to be immediately available and to remain available until expended," so as to make the clause read:

For reimbursing Indians for live stock which may be hereafter destroyed on account of being infected with dourine or other contagious diseases, and for expenses in connection with the work of eradicating and preventing such diseases, to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, \$100,000, said amount to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,000 of this amount may be used in reimbursing Indians for horses killed previous to the passage of the act of May 18, 1916, for which they have not heretofore been reimbursed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 14, after the word "sold," to insert "to the highest bidder," so as to make the clause read:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to cause to be sold, to the highest bidder, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, any tract or part of a tract of land purchased by the United States for day school or other Indian administrative uses, not exceeding 160 acres in any one tract, when said land or a part thereof is no longer needed for the original purpose; the net proceeds therefrom in all cases to be paid into the Treasury of the United States; title to be evidenced by a patent in fee simple for such lands as can be described in terms of the legal survey, or by deed duly executed by the Secretary of the Interior containing such metes-and-bounds description as will identify the land so conveyed as the land which had been purchased: *Provided*, That where the purchase price was paid from tribal funds, such proceeds shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the respective tribes of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 4, to strike out:

That from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall have the power to authorize any superintendent, clerk, or other employee in the Indian field service to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 9, to insert:

Hereafter, for the purpose of reducing the expense of enforcing and administering the several statutes conferring or imposing duties upon the Secretary of the Interior, he shall have authority from time to time to make designations of not to exceed five special agents employed by the Creek Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma to investigate cases brought or to be brought in behalf of said tribe, or members thereof, to administer oaths, of which designations the courts of the United States shall take judicial notice. Any such agent so designated is hereby empowered, in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him, to administer to, or take from, any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit whenever such oath, affirmation, or affidavit is for use in any prosecution or proceeding under investigation by such persons. Any such oath, affirmation, or affidavit administered or taken by or before such agent shall, when offered or used in any court of the United States, have like force and effect as if administered or taken by or before the clerk of such court, without further proof of the identity or authority of such agent.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 4, to strike out:

That the following provision of the act approved March 11, 1904 (33 Stat. L., p. 65), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights of way across Indian lands for the conveyance of oil and gas, to wit: "No such lines shall be constructed across Indian lands, as above mentioned, until authority therefor has first been obtained from, and the maps of definite location of said lines approved by, the Secretary of the Interior," be, and the same hereby is, amended to read as follows: "No such lines shall be constructed across Indian lands, as above mentioned, until authority therefor has first been obtained from the Secretary of the Interior."

And insert:

That the following provision of the act approved March 11, 1904 (33 Stat. L., p. 65), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights of way across Indian lands for the conveyance of oil and gas, to wit: "No such lines shall be constructed across Indian lands, as above mentioned, until authority therefor has first been obtained from, and the maps of definite location of said lines approved by, the Secretary of the Interior," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Before title to rights of way, applied for hereunder shall vest, maps of definite location shall be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That before such approval the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, grant temporary permits revocable in his discretion for the construction of such lines."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Arizona and New Mexico," in section 2, on page 19, line 16, after the word "purposes," to insert "and for the installation of pumping machinery"; in line 22, after the word "land," to insert "\$25,000"; and in line 24, after the word "structures," to strike

out "\$15,000" and insert "in all \$40,000"; so as to make the clause read:

For the construction and repair of necessary channels and laterals for the utilization of water in connection with the pumping plant for irrigation purposes and for the installation of pumping machinery on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., as provided in the act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 273), for the purpose of securing an appropriation of water for the irrigation of approximately 150,000 acres of land, \$25,000; and for maintaining and operating the pumping plant, canals, and structures, in all, \$40,000, reimbursable as provided in said act, and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 20, after the word "Indians," to strike out "on the Navajo Reservation, \$25,000" and insert "\$30,000," so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the development of a water supply for the Navajo Indians, \$30,000, to be immediately available, reimbursable out of any funds of said Indians now or hereafter available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 12, after "\$175,000," to insert:

Provided, That the water diverted from the Gila River by said diversion dam shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior to the Indian lands of said reservation and to the private and public lands in said county in accordance with the respective rights and priorities of such lands to the beneficial use of said water as may be determined by agreement of the owners thereof with the Secretary of the Interior or by a court of competent jurisdiction: *And provided further*, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said diversion dam and other works and rights shall be divided equitably by the Secretary of the Interior between the Indian lands and the private and public lands in said county; and said cost as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable as provided in section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 522); but the construction charge as fixed for the private and public lands in said county shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of an act extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, approved August 13, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 686); *And provided further*, That said project shall only be undertaken if the Secretary of the Interior shall be able to make or provide for what he shall deem to be satisfactory adjustments of the rights to the water to be diverted by said diversion dam or carried in canals, and satisfactory arrangements for the inclusion of lands within said project and the purchase of property rights which he shall deem necessary to be acquired, and shall determine and declare said project to be feasible.

So as to make the clause read:

For completing the construction by the Indian Service of a diversion dam and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River at a site above Florence, Ariz., \$100,000, to remain available until expended, the total cost not to exceed \$175,000, and for beginning the construction of the necessary canals and structures to carry the natural flow of the Gila River to the Indian lands of the Gila Indian Reservation and to public and private lands in Pinal County, as provided in the Indian appropriation act approved May 18, 1916, \$75,000, to remain available until expended; in all, \$175,000: *Provided*, That the water diverted from the Gila River by said diversion dam shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior to the Indian lands of said reservation and to the private and public lands in said county in accordance with the respective rights and priorities of such lands to the beneficial use of said water as may be determined by agreement of the owners thereof with the Secretary of the Interior or by a court of competent jurisdiction: *And provided further*, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said diversion dam and other works and rights shall be divided equitably by the Secretary of the Interior between the Indian lands and the private and public lands in said county; and said cost as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable as provided in section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 522); but the construction charge as fixed for the private and public lands in said county shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of an act extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, approved August 13, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 686); *And provided further*, That said project shall only be undertaken if the Secretary of the Interior shall be able to make or provide for what he shall deem to be satisfactory adjustments of the rights to the water to be diverted by said diversion dam or carried in canals, and satisfactory arrangements for the inclusion of lands within said project and the purchase of property rights which he shall deem necessary to be acquired, and shall determine and declare said project to be feasible.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 16, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to purchase lands and water rights, with improvements, for the use of the Navajo Indians located on the public domain of Arizona, \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 21, to insert:

For the construction of two bridges over the Little Colorado and Canyon Diablo Rivers near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., \$42,500, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to insert:

That so much of article 2 of the agreement with the Indians of the San Carlos Indian Reservation concluded on February 25, 1896, accepted, ratified, and confirmed in the act approved June 10, 1896, reading "and that said money shall be paid to them in cash from time to time as the same shall become available, pro rata, share and share alike, to each man, woman, and child of the tribes now living upon and entitled to the privileges of the said reservation," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read, "and that said money, as the same becomes available, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be paid to or expended for the benefit of the Indians entitled thereto in such manner and for such purposes as he may prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "California," in section 3, page 24, line 17, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$42,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 3. For support and civilization of Indians in California, including pay of employees, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 20, after the word "Indians," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase of lands for the homeless Indians in California, including improvements thereon, for the use and occupancy of said Indians, \$25,000, said funds to be expended under such regulations and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the chairman in charge of the bill how many Indians in California are still homeless? My inquiry is prompted by the recitals on page 24, beginning with line 18, where \$25,000 is appropriated for the purchase of lands for the homeless Indians in California.

Mr. ASHURST. I can furnish the Senator with that information, I think, in just a moment.

Mr. THOMAS. We have been appropriating money for homeless Indians in California ever since I have been here, and the more money we appropriate the more homeless they seem to be.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish first to say in a general statement that the California Indians have never been treated with that degree of legislative equity with which they ought to have been treated. Answering the Senator's question directly, there are now 2,782 homeless or landless Indians in the State of California.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator inform me how many there were a year ago or two years ago who were homeless? The amount named seems to be the equivalent of the Democratic majority out there. [Laughter.]

Mr. ASHURST. Well, that is very substantial. With the permission of the Senate and the indulgence of the Senator, I will read from page 135 of the House hearings the figures regarding the purchase of lands for landless Indians in California.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the amount appropriated was \$10,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Which year was that?

Mr. ASHURST. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1917. That is the year we are now in.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, \$10,000 was appropriated.

The following is an analysis of the expenditure:

Land purchased, \$15,217.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The table at the top of page 136 gives the Senator the information he desires.

There were purchased prior to 1913, under the appropriations of 1906 and 1908, 6,420 acres for 38 bands of Indians. There were 3,291 members of those bands.

There were purchased subsequently thereto, under the acts of 1914, 1916, and the joint resolution of 1915, 1,317 acres for 14 bands, the members of the bands being 863 in number.

The next purchase was 685 acres for 9 bands, comprising 617 members.

Mr. THOMAS. I am obliged to the Senator for his information. I notice, however—

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I am sure the Senator thinks these homeless Indians ought to have lands, and I am sure the Senator would much rather the Government would buy lands for them than to lease them some Government lands, would he not?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I do not object to giving the homeless Indians lands; but my curiosity is aroused, whenever these appropriations come in regular succession, as to how many Indians have been furnished homes and how many still remain homeless.

Mr. MYERS. But my idea is that the Senator would prefer a sale to leasing lands to them, would he not?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, certainly. I want to do anything at any time that will get title in the public lands out of the Government of the United States, even if the title is conferred upon Indians.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, this will do that. As I said before, there are now 2,782 homeless and landless Indians in the State of California.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think the Senator from Montana sees the purpose of my inquiry. What amazes me is that these Indians continue to be homeless; and I venture to predict that 10 years from now we will still be appropriating money for homeless Indians.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator should bear in mind that when we entered upon the policy of purchasing lands for homeless Indians in the United States there were nearly 8,000 of them.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know anything about it except what the Senator tells me. I am glad some of them have been provided for.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from Kansas pointed out the number that have been supplied with lands in years gone by.

Mr. THOMAS. But as the Indians decrease in number the appropriations increase in amount.

Mr. ASHURST. I think this will be the last year that this appropriation will be necessary.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator think that?

Mr. ASHURST. I think this will be the last appropriation that will be necessary to purchase lands for homeless Indians in California.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is a young man. I think his head will be as gray as mine before these appropriations cease to appear in the appropriation bills.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator from Arizona proposes to furnish them all homes by this appropriation. There will be no further homeless Indians in California.

Mr. THOMAS. As suggested by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], when the last homeless Indian is provided with a home in California the probabilities are that we will begin to furnish homeless Indians with homes in New Jersey. [Laughter.] Now may I ask if the increase to \$25,000 in this bill is also due to the high cost of living?

Mr. ASHURST. The high cost of land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 4, after the word "allotments," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

For reclamation and maintenance charge on Yuma allotments, \$40,000, to remain available until expended and to be reimbursed from the sale of surplus lands or from other funds that may be available, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1911.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 12, after "\$3,500," to strike out "in all, \$21,700" and insert "for new school building, \$12,000; in all, \$33,700," so as to make the clause read:

For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California, including pay of superintendent, \$18,200; for general repairs and improvements, \$3,500; for new school building, \$12,000; in all, \$33,700.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask if the Indian children at the Fort Bidwell Indian schools are now in any kind of a school building, or are they being taught in any way?

Mr. ASHURST. I will ask the Senator to consider page 140 of the House committee's hearings, from which I am going to read. The commissioner stated as follows:

We are asking for a new school building, \$12,000; dairy farm, \$5,000; making the total \$33,700. Last year we had an appropriation of \$21,800. I offer for the record the following justification for that estimate:

Indian school, Fort Bidwell, Cal.

Fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, amount appropriated..... \$18,200.00

Fiscal year ended June 30, 1916:	
Amount appropriated.....	20,500.00
Amount expended.....	19,315.74

Unexpended balance..... 1,184.26

Analysis of expenditures:	
Salaries and wages.....	10,878.78
Transportation of supplies.....	295.03
Telegraph and telephone service.....	7.88
Subsistence supplies.....	1,962.46
Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.....	2,034.28
Forage.....	173.00
Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.....	1,458.86
Educational, stationery, and office supplies.....	283.14
Medical supplies.....	155.95
Implements, vehicles, tools, etc.....	339.06
Sundry supplies, equipment, etc.....	1,649.76
Miscellaneous.....	77.54

Total..... 19,315.74

Mr. SMOOT. That does not answer my inquiry.

Mr. ASHURST. I will give the information.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate committee made an amendment to the provision appropriating \$12,000 for the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California, for a new school building. Can the Senator tell me why they want a new school building or—

Mr. ASHURST. The estimates of the department call for the same, and the statement made by the assistant commissioner was to the effect that such a building is necessary. I have not the printed hearings before me.

Mr. SMOOT. In the past they have had sufficient room for educating those Indian children, have they not?

Mr. ASHURST. Let me answer the question by reading what the assistant commissioner said, if the Senator please:

The new construction work required at this school will include a new school building. This is an urgent need, the one now in use being an old building used as a hospital when the United States troops were stationed there. A building large enough to provide two or three classrooms and an assembly hall is required.

That is the language of the assistant commissioner.

Mr. SMOOT. We have just passed the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The Senator will notice that the Committee on Appropriations cut everything out of that bill that could be cut out. They allowed no increases, as appeared in the estimates for all the departments. As I said last night, if the Committee on Appropriations had yielded and granted what the gentlemen of the departments and bureaus had asked for, the bill would have been increased nearly \$3,000,000.

Mr. ASHURST. I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator from Arizona if he does not believe that under the conditions of the Treasury today, with, I understand, six hundred and odd million dollars to be raised by the issuing of bonds and the imposition of additional taxes upon the American people, the Indians at the Fort Bidwell School could not get along for another year with the buildings that they already have?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not believe it. The committee has taken care to eliminate buildings in every place. The committee has used the most scrupulous care, and in a dozen instances has declined to appropriate for new sanitary buildings. If I remember correctly, these buildings in California, the schools being isolated, were about the only ones the committee did allow; and they seemed to appeal to the committee with some force, because the appropriation was asked for last year and denied. It is an urgent necessity on these two reservations.

Mr. SMOOT. It was denied last year; and has any real harm come to the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. The necessity is greater.

Mr. SMOOT. Would any harm come to the Indians by a refusal to grant the request this year?

Mr. ASHURST. The necessity is greater this year. They are not given proper and adequate facilities for the housing and instruction of the school children. The necessity is very great.

Mr. SMOOT. This very question was presented to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House. They pleaded with the House to put in this provision. The House did not think it was necessary, and therefore withheld it.

I recognize, Mr. President, that it is a very unfortunate item to begin to try to economize on when the question of education is involved, but I do not know where we are going to begin to economize. Every item we bring up it seems to me that that is not the proper place to begin.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I think we shall have to advertise for a place to begin. I do not know how else we will be able to discover it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the House had this proposition presented to them and presented in the very language that was read by the Senator having the bill in charge, and after considering it and holding hearings upon it decided that the Indians could get along another year. I believe the Senate ought to agree with the House, and I believe this item ought not to be allowed.

Mr. LANE. I would suggest one thing to the Senator which may have influenced the committee's action in regard to this particular school, a fact which was brought to the attention of the Senate committee and not the House committee. A short time ago, a few weeks ago, three or four little children—girls aged from 8 to 12—ran away from the school. One of them was found the next day, or a day or two afterwards, frozen to death, and one or two others had their feet frozen so badly they had to be amputated. It must be an awful place, or an awful management of children, and the fear of punishment dreadful, when little children 8 to 12 years old would go out on the hillside and prefer to die by freezing rather than to go back and face the tender mercies or comforts of such a home as that.

It may be possible that that had an influence. It does influence me. I did not vote for it, for I rather suspected perhaps it was the treatment which they received from their guardians, but the statement of the fact in an excerpt taken

from the papers and publications might have influenced the committee to be a little overgenerous. The condition of the Indians all over the United States is miserable. I am going to offer a substitute to clean this business out if possible.

Mr. SMOOT. The very next paragraph provides for a new school building at Greenville Indian School. I wish further to say that I do not believe a school child, because of the character of the building, would go out and freeze to death. The treatment might be such that a child would rather die than go back.

Mr. THOMAS. The child may have run away, just as children do at times, for no particular reason.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to know if the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Utah agree about this matter.

Mr. THOMAS. We are holding an inquest.

Mr. LANE. I think the Senator is mistaken. I know he is mistaken, if he thinks that the surrounding conditions, with good sanitation, with pleasant surroundings and agreeable and comfortable rooms, when compared with moldy, damp, cold, and dreary ones, will not influence a normal child, Indian or white, either to stay or run away when the opportunity presents itself, and that it would go and perhaps even freeze to death rather than return. There are some of those buildings in bad condition, many of them throughout the country, some of which I have seen, and one could not blame the child. I do not say that there may have been a certain rule of discipline which the child dreaded so that until too late it would stay out rather than return. There is more in the bill than appears on the surface, and not to its credit.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the building occupied to-day for school purposes at Fort Bidwell, Cal., was a hospital used by the Government of the United States, and it does seem to me—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I was going to ask, inasmuch as apparently this is controverted, that it may go over until to-morrow, and that the reading of the bill be resumed.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to vote. I want to vote on it.

Mr. ASHURST. Let it go over until to-morrow, and it can be investigated further. I wish to go on with the other items in the bill for half an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Is that course agreeable?

Mr. SMOOT. All right; but I want the next item, for the Greenville Indian School, to go over.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, there is no reason why this item should go over. The committee considered it with a great deal of care. Many of these buildings have been condemned as insanitary and unfit. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that I objected to many of the proposed increases, but after I heard the statement from the Indian Office and from the men who are thoroughly acquainted with the conditions in this particular school I was satisfied that this increase should be made.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not read all the testimony that was given to the committee in the House, but the testimony read by the Senator having the bill in charge said nothing in relation to the sanitary condition of the school.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator there was a great deal of discussion about this particular school. The Senate committee hearings have not yet been printed, or at least I have no copy.

Mr. ASHURST. The hearings will be available in the morning, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. GRONNA. I am sure the committee was justified in increasing this appropriation, and I am quite sure that when the Senate knows the facts it will not strike out the appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if we take up the average rural school in the United States, it would hardly meet the approval of the United States Senate as a perfectly suitable school. I have not any question but that the Indian school at this place as it now stands is up at least to the average rural school.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. I think this is a time for us not to add anything that is not absolutely necessary. For myself, while I am here I expect to vote against these increases. I regret very much that the Committee on Indian Affairs has added a million or more dollars to the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Nearly \$2,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Nearly \$2,000,000. The policy elsewhere has been to cut down our appropriations rather than increase them. If there is any reasonable way to get along with-

out these increases, I think we ought to vote them down and in addition try to find a place to make some reduction in the House appropriations.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish simply to suggest to the Senator from Georgia that this is an old abandoned fort. There are about 20 buildings there, and many of them are in a very bad condition. The Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs informed the committee at the Senate committee hearings that many of them are in an unfit condition for use and urged that this building was needed perhaps more than any other in the service.

They are entitled to some credit. The committee will remember that we had this item up a year ago when it was costing two hundred and fifty-odd dollars per capita to educate the children at Fort Bidwell. Under the arrangement this year they propose to carry it on for \$167. I think that makes a pretty good showing for the office. It is a reduction of nearly \$100 per capita. I believe the showing that was made before the Senate committee justified an appropriation for this new building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the understanding that the Fort Bidwell and Greenville Indian Schools amendments shall go over?

Mr. ASHURST. Let them go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will go over.

Mr. THOMAS. It is the understanding that the paragraph, beginning in line 14 down to line 18, inclusive, goes over also?

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that both may go over.

Mr. THOMAS. Let them both go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, they will go over.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand the other was not read.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 17, after "\$3,500," to strike out "in all, \$21,700" and insert "for new school building, \$9,000; in all, \$30,700," so as to make the clause read:

For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Greenville Indian School, Cal., including pay of superintendent, \$18,200; for general repairs and improvements, including laundry equipment, \$3,500; for new school building, \$9,000; in all, \$30,700.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 23, to insert:

For beginning the enlargement and improvement of the irrigation project upon the Torres Indian Reservation, Cal., for the irrigation of approximately 3,000 acres of Indian land, in accordance with the plans and estimates submitted by the chief engineer in the Indian Service and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, \$25,000, to remain available until expended and to be reimbursed to the United States in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That the total cost of said irrigation project shall not exceed \$150,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if this money is to be reimbursed to the Government?

Mr. ASHURST. It is. If the Senator will pardon me I will read from page 15 of the hearings, being the information the committee had on the subject:

Appropriation, \$25,000; estimate, \$25,000; not allowed by House. The Torres Indian Reservation is in the Coachella Valley, Cal., at the head of the Salton Sea, and some distance northwest therefrom. The locality is generally below sea level, on the eastern edge of the San Jacinto Mountain Range, in Riverside County, Cal. There has been no previous appropriation by Congress. The Indians, numbering about 210, are known as Cahuillas. The area of the contemplated project is 4,200 acres. The source of water supply is from wells and it is proposed to sink some large wells which will enable the Indians to compete with the whites who have taken up alternate sections, the reservation having been set aside after the railroad land-grant selections had been made.

This is reimbursable, and the total limited cost of the project will be \$150,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know whether the Indians have a fund at present in the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. ASHURST. They have not at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. How is it to be reimbursed? By payment by the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. By payment from year to year as they earn money from the produce and crops they sell.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no provision here for that, but simply that it is to be reimbursed. It may be in 50 years or in 100 years.

Mr. ASHURST. That language is used invariably in the Indian appropriation bill. It really is to be done in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, for this reason: Some tribes have repaid the whole sum in one year. Others do not repay with the same alacrity

that they promised. It is left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate rules and regulations as to when and in what manner and in what sum the money shall be repaid.

On the irrigation projects the white men have repaid in 20 years. I assume that the same time, say 20 years, will be given to the Indians. I do not wish to express a personal opinion, but I think this is a worthy appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator say that there are only 120 Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. There are about 210 of these Indians.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are giving them in the proportion of about \$700 to an Indian.

Mr. ASHURST. If the distinguished Senator from Georgia will pardon me, we are not giving it to them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are appropriating it now, and we have got to raise it by taxation or by some sort of a revenue system. I do not know how we are going to raise it.

Mr. ASHURST. We are going to advance \$25,000 this year and pledge the Government to advance the other \$125,000 in the future. I am sure the Indians will repay this sum with the same promptness and with the same alacrity and with the same fidelity that the white men repay the sums they have had for similar projects out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to ask the Senator from Arizona what we are going to advance it from? From the deficit?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand there is not anything in the Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. From the deficit we will have next year?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Of course, if we have any money left after we spend 40 times this sum for unnecessary battleships and armor plate I think we might as well give it to the Indians as anybody else. But I rose for the purpose of asking the Senator if this tribe of Indians have any money in the Treasury at all?

Mr. ASHURST. They have no money. They simply have a reservation and it is a checkerboard affair. Private parties own certain sections and the Indians own alternate sections. They are in a very warm climate and one which is very arid, but there is good land and good soil there which will produce crops in great abundance if the water is turned upon it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. This is a loan by the Government to those Indians for the purpose of irrigating and improving their land?

Mr. ASHURST. That is it exactly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Have those Indians up to date been self-sustaining?

Mr. ASHURST. They have never within my knowledge had a dollar or a particle of assistance from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I desire to submit that this proposition involves practically no expenditure on the part of the Government. The Indians are the wards of the Nation. The Nation now becomes the backer of the Indians. They have no other means by which they may develop the otherwise fertile land which, when water is applied to it, becomes highly productive. This contemplates a loan practically of \$25,000 this year for the beginning of the work, and that the Government shall be surely reimbursed as that land will be made fertile by the application of water.

I think we have a duty to our wards; in the chancery court it was regarded as the highest duty; and to abandon them to a State where they can not by their industry help themselves is an abandonment of a trust. I think that in the increased values by taxation this money will ultimately come back, even if there were no direct repayment, to the Government—not only to the Federal Government, but to the State government—by increasing the natural wealth, with the assistance of irrigation, of the whole country.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] talks of wars. The nations are involved in war for the purpose of acquiring territory, and here by peaceful methods we propose to acquire territory, for it is none the less the acquisition of territory when we reclaim it from the desert. So, from whatever point it is viewed, I think that this is a very wise appropriation even at a time when there is a deficit in the Treasury.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs to say that these Indian lands were in a kind of checkerboard situation, alternate sections being owned by private parties. Is there any water available for these lands in the hands of private parties?

Mr. PHELAN. Water in that region is derived from wells, as I understand.

Mr. ASHURST. This whole region is below sea level, being near the Salton Sea, and, as Senators know, many years ago land grants were made and the alternate sections have been acquired by the Indians.

Mr. JONES. Is it proposed to irrigate the Indian land by wells?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. About how deep do they have to go to get water sufficient for irrigating purposes?

Mr. ASHURST. Let me read from the report of the committee. I will give the Senator a statement in reference to that matter in a moment.

Mr. PHELAN. We have in California the lowest land in the United States, and we also have the highest land. In the neighborhood of this valley, I think the land is 120 feet below the level of the sea, and we have in Mount Whitney the highest mountain in continental United States outside of Alaska. Having that low land, the only means of getting water upon it, as it is a desert and there is no rainfall, is by the sinking of wells.

Mr. JONES. I suppose that private parties have irrigated the land, which, of course, would indicate about how deep they would have to go.

Mr. ASHURST. Reading from page 144 of the House committee hearings, I find the following:

The irrigation work here proposed is to supply eventually about 4,200 acres of very fertile desert land in the so-called Coachilla Valley in southern California. The Indian reservation at this point consists of alternate sections of land caused by the fact that the reservation was set aside after the railroad land grant had been made. This has permitted white settlers to occupy the railway land and has caused extensive water development upon the white lands, reducing the flow of the small artesian wells drilled some years ago for the Indians to such a point that they are no longer of use for irrigation. It is proposed to drill large wells and install pumping plants of the same type which are very successfully used by the whites on the adjoining land and distribute the water through impervious pipe lines in order to preserve to the greatest extent possible the valuable water supply. The fact that the ground-water plane of the deep wells proposed will either be just about the surface of the ground, or even above it, makes the expense of pumping comparatively light, and the development which has already been made by the white people previous proves the value of the proposed work, which will permit the industrious Indians of this reservation to become entirely self-supporting.

Mr. JONES. Where do these Indians now live?

Mr. ASHURST. They live near by on the land, notwithstanding its extreme aridity.

Mr. JONES. I know these lands are desert lands, and I suppose if they were not irrigated the Indians could not live on them and that they were probably living somewhere else.

Mr. ASHURST. They are nomadic in a way; they roam about from place to place, but for a large part of the time they live on these lands, notwithstanding their extreme aridity and lack of water.

Mr. JONES. Does the department hope that these Indians will themselves cultivate the land or will the land be leased to white people for the benefit of the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. It is the hope and expectation of the department that the Indians themselves will raise crops on the land.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator from Arizona will pardon me, I will say to the Senator from Washington that the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs stated that it was the intention of the department to divide the land into 10-acre lots and for the Indians themselves to cultivate the land.

Mr. JONES. How many acres do each one of these Indians have?

Mr. ASHURST. There are 4,200 acres in all.

Mr. JONES. How many acres does each Indian have as an allotment?

Mr. GRONNA. They have no allotments whatever.

Mr. JONES. Do they have no allotments at all?

Mr. GRONNA. No. This is simply land which has been bought for them; these Indians are on the land, and it has been divided.

Mr. JONES. Is it proposed to allot to each of these Indians a particular tract?

Mr. GRONNA. About 10 acres.

Mr. JONES. That would take up all the lands of the reservation, so that there would be no land left to sell to anybody.

Mr. GRONNA. That is correct.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, of course I have not very much hope of the Indians themselves cultivating this land, but I do know what irrigation does for land of this character. If the lands can be irrigated for the sum of money that is provided in this bill, as the Senator from California has said, it will be money well invested. I hope the Indians may be induced to cultivate the land to some extent at any rate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Washington that these Indians now have a reservation of 20,800 acres, 200 acres of which they are farming by irrigation, and this project will cover 4,200 acres more.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is now nearly half past 5 o'clock. May I ask the Senator from Arizona if he would be willing to adjourn at this time?

Mr. ASHURST. If that is desired, and there is no objection, I will move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I withhold the motion.

Mr. MYERS. Before that motion is put, may I not be recognized to ask unanimous consent—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to know whether the amendment last discussed has been agreed to?

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That amendment has not been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unfinished business will be laid before the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. I object for a moment. I thought I heard an expression to the effect that the item was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not been agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. That does not mean that it was disagreed to. Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; not at all. We simply have not acted on it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, one of the assistant doorkeepers has just notified me that there is to be a resolution come over from the House, announcing the death of a Representative, and that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] desires to present resolutions. If that be the case, I hardly think that we ought to adjourn for a few moments, but that we should wait a while to see if the resolution comes over. I do not know whether it is desired to have an executive session or not.

Mr. ASHURST. We can proceed with the bill until the resolution comes over.

Mr. JONES. Why can we not proceed with the bill for half an hour?

Mr. MYERS. Then I withdraw my request that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 26, after line 9, to insert:

That section 3 of the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 712), entitled "An act for the relief of Mission Indians in the State of California," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to authorize the President, in his discretion and whenever he shall deem it for the interests of the Indians affected thereby, to extend the trust period for such time as may be advisable on the lands held in trust for the use and benefit of the Mission Bands or villages of Indians in California: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause allotments to be made to the Indians belonging to and having tribal rights on the Mission Indian reservations in the State of California, in areas as provided in section 17 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., 859), instead of as provided in section 4 of the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 713): *Provided*, That this act shall not affect any allotments heretofore patented to these Indians.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator please explain just what that means?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, this legislation was incorporated at the request of the Interior Department, and the Interior Department submitted the following letter addressed to the chairman of the committee dated May 10, 1916:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 10, 1916.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On January 17, 1916, I invited attention to the urgent necessity of a law to authorize the extension of the trust period on lands patented to various Mission Indian bands in California. As a result Senate bill 4765 was introduced to amend the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 712), so as to authorize the President to extend the trust period on lands patented to the Mission Bands or villages of Indians in California whenever he shall deem it for the interests of the Indians.

As the trust period on approximately 10,000 acres of these trust lands will expire in September, 1917, it would be desirable if we could obtain this legislation during the present session, rather than try to procure the required authority at the following short session—

This was asked for at the last session—

These are tribal lands, and the Indians should not be permitted to have unrestricted control over their disposal. I shall be pleased to see favorable action taken on Senate bill 4765.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs,
United States Senate.

In other words, these trust patents are about to expire, and it is not believed wise, judicious, or proper to permit the Indians to alienate the land. That is the very thing that we want to avoid.

Mr. SMOOT. The lands have not yet been alienated by the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. No; they belong to the Indians in commonalty.

Mr. SMOOT. This is merely designed to extend the trust period to prevent alienation?

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that ought to be done if the Indians are not capable of handling the lands themselves.

Mr. ASHURST. That is the situation, and I hope the proposed legislation will be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It does not involve any appropriation, does it?

Mr. ASHURST. No appropriation is involved.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. Now, I ask that the Indian appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SMOOT. The resolutions, as I understand, have not come over from the House as yet.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The resolutions are not here, and we can agree to the next amendment, as it is a reduction.

Mr. ASHURST. I thought the resolutions had come over and was about to be presented. That is why I asked that the bill be laid aside. I now ask that the reading of the bill be proceeded with.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 27, after line 5, to insert:

That the last proviso of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition and sale of lands known as the Klamath River Indian Reservation," approved June 17, 1892, reading: "*Provided further*, That the proceeds arising from the sale of said lands shall constitute a fund to be used under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for the maintenance and education of the Indians now residing on said lands and their children," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read:

"*Provided further*, That the proceeds arising from the sale of said lands shall constitute a fund to be used under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for the maintenance and education of the Indians and their children now residing on said lands and for the construction of roads, trails, and other improvements for their benefit."

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I was not present when that amendment was considered in the committee, or I would have insisted on an amendment to it. I have asked the Assistant Secretary if that fund could not be paid per capita to the Indians to improve their allotments. I should like to have the amendment go over, and I will offer an amendment to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator that this amendment be passed over?

Mr. LANE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, under the head of "Florida," in section 4, page 27, line 23, after the word "education," to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$5,000"; so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 4. For relief of distress among the Seminole Indians in Florida, and for purposes of their civilization and education, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I can not understand that amendment. It seems to be a reduction of \$3,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; and it has been agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. Startling as it may seem, that expresses the action of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask if there are any other such surprising things in the bill?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not wish to injure his health by shocking the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. This is the only oasis of decrease in a desert of increase.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 28, after line 22, to insert:

IOWA.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to expend for the benefit of the Indians entitled thereto, the sum of \$10,334.96, together with the interest which has or may hereafter accrue thereon, remaining in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of

Indians of the State of Iowa, from the sum of \$42,893.25 transferred to the credit of those Indians under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1896.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That does not involve an appropriation, as I understand, but simply allows the Indians to use a part of their funds?

Mr. ASHURST. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I have nothing further to say about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 29, line 17, after the word "improvements," to strike out "\$2,000; in all, \$16,860," and insert "\$4,000; in all, \$18,860," so as to make the clause read:

For support and education of 80 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans., including pay of superintendent, \$14,860; for general repairs and improvements, \$4,000; in all, \$18,860.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think we ought to accept the amount for repairs at the Kickapoo Indian school provided by the House. They allowed \$2,000, and I do not think we ought to double that amount. We ought not to go through this bill merely increasing the allowances the House has made. If the House has in this one instance been a little economical, I think we ought to follow it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator that this amendment be passed over?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I do not ask that it go over, but I am opposed to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for a division.

Mr. ASHURST. Just a moment. Before the division is had, I wish to say that the committee gave this matter careful consideration, and at all times the committee had in view the condition of the Treasury. This is one of the increases made by the committee that would seem to be worthy and necessary. This appropriation was not increased merely for the purpose of making an increase or suggesting an amendment. The hearings before House committee and the hearings before the Senate committee convinced the committee, and I think all the members thereof, that this item, an increase of \$2,000, was proper, expedient, wise, and just.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if it is not true that a good deal of the work of the committee was done before they realized the fact that there was an absolute necessity for our spending for the fiscal year 1917-18 nothing that we were not obliged to spend and that the policy of economy and retrenchment was essential? I do not say that if we had a bulging Treasury, with all the money we needed, it would not be a good investment, but what I am objecting to is to spending any money anywhere that it is not absolutely necessary to expend during the fiscal year 1917-18.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, at least one member of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs realized when that committee was in session that we were facing a very large deficit. I do not think the committee was oblivious of that fact, nor does it seem to me that a bulging Treasury would justify unwarrantable appropriations.

The Indian situation presents this condition, and I should like the Senator from Georgia to consider it: When we were doling out rations and annuities to a large number of Indian tribes it took very little money to administer Indian affairs. The Government finally adopted the policy of individualizing the Indian, taking him out from his tribal condition, and as far as possible and as fast as possible making the individual Indian a self-sustaining being. It has been no easy problem; it has been a problem beset with difficulty; it has been a problem accompanied by many, many mistakes; but it does involve, and it will involve from year to year for some time to come, an increased expenditure. It costs more. When you try to make the Indian self-sustaining, when you have to have a larger personnel for administration to help guide and lead the Indian, when you begin to irrigate his land for him, when you begin to buy feed and machinery and stock for him, it is bound to cost more.

The Indian Committee went over this bill, and went over it carefully. Of course it is within the province of Senators to criticize it. It is within the province of Senators to express surprise that the Indian Committee may have reduced, here and there, an item in this bill; but I do not feel that the attitude that is taken toward the committee is exactly fair. It is perfectly proper, and I am finding no fault with that on the part of any Senator or group of Senators, to reject these items. But

to say, as I have heard on the floor this afternoon, "Let us strike this; let us go for this," without waiting one moment to hear a justification for an item, it does seem to me, if I may be pardoned for the expression, is hardly the proper way to deal with a question where we have taken a people without their consent and placed them in the attitude of wards, we assuming the attitude of their guardians.

It may be that some items here could be deferred, although I think every item that has been increased is justified upon the principle either that buildings have reached the point where decay has set in, and the continuance of decay is not economy, or that postponing additional help to the Indians is not economy, and falls short of our duty to them.

Whatever is done I do hope that the consideration of this bill will not be proceeded with in a spirit which does seem to me, if I may be pardoned the expression, to be hardly the spirit with which to approach the consideration of a bill which involves our attitude not toward our equals, not toward our constituents, but toward a people that we hold as wards, we occupying the position assumed by ourselves of guardians.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am quite sure that when the Senator from Georgia has the information as to why the increase is made, he will not object to it. The Senator from Georgia was one of the Members of this body who made it possible for the white child to get a vocational education. This amount is requested for the construction of a building to instruct the Indian boy in shopwork, and for physical training, indoor training, which is necessary in that climate on account of the inclement weather. I am quite sure that the Senator from Georgia will not object to it. It is absolutely necessary, as was shown to the committee by the Indian Office.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in order to preserve the parliamentary status, I ask that the consideration of the Indian bill be discontinued at this time, and that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, that will be done. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE FINLEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. DAVID EDWARD FINLEY, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. DAVID EDWARD FINLEY, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions the Speaker appointed as the committee on the part of the House Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. LEVER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, Mr. WHALEY, Mr. RAGSDALE, Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina, Mr. MOON, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. BELL, Mr. BARNHART, Mr. BLACKMON, Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, Mr. MANN, Mr. STEENSON, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. KAHN, Mr. BRITT, and Mr. WASON.

Mr. TILLMAN. I send to the desk the following resolutions and ask that they be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 331) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. DAVID E. FINLEY, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join a committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, under the second resolution, appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. FERNALD.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I move, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 27, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 26, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou from whom all blessings flow, humbly and reverently we bow before Thee and acknowledge our indebtedness and most devoutly pray that our gratitude may blossom into a fuller service to Thee and our fellow men; that thus we may lift ourselves and those with whom we come in contact into a purer atmosphere; that our religious energy may not waste itself in hollow forms and ceremonies, but become a living, vitalizing force under the divine leadership of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3526. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes" approved December 17, 1914;

S. 5504. An act for the relief of Louis Blanchette, alias Lewis Blanchard, alias Louis White;

S. 2292. An act to acquire the manuscript of Charles Chaillé-Long, containing an account of the unveiling of the McClellan Statue;

S. 5974. An act for the relief of Ellen B. Walker;

S. 391. An act for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand stamp patents, or otherwise;

S. 2704. An act for the relief of Albert L. Ream;

S. 4620. An act for the relief of James B. Smock;

S. 4915. An act for the relief of Oliver C. Rice;

S. 6698. An act for the relief of Edward L. Keyes;

S. 2512. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of West Virginia;

S. 2461. An act authorizing the appointment of Dr. Bert R. Huntington as first lieutenant, Medical Corps, United States Army;

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to grant the free use, for military drill, of rifles to duly accredited camps of the Sons of Veterans Reserve;

S. 4500. An act to incorporate the World's Sunday School Association;

S. 6737. An act for the relief of A. J. Lowary;

S. 6783. An act for the relief of William F. Carter;

S. 6671. An act to validate the homestead entries of Anna W. Thrailkill;

S. 6730. An act to revoke authority to lease Sibley Island, in the Missouri River, to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.;

S. 3731. An act for the relief of John G. Young;

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Jacob Nice;

S. 6949. An act for the relief of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co., and the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.;

S. 784. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Belton, Mont., for hotel purposes;

S. 6692. An act to amend section 6 of an act to expedite the settlement of title to lands in the State of California;

S. 6829. An act to provide for the disposition of public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the reclamation laws, and which are no longer needed in connection with said laws;

S. 833. An act to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade;

S. 6862. An act for the relief of Amos Dahuff;

S. 5344. An act for the regulation of the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto;

S. 1724. An act to reimburse the First National Bank of Owatonna, Minn., for revenue stamps stolen or lost in transit; and

S. 698. An act for the relief of John L. O'Mara.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 193. An act to provide for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy and to prevent the spread of leprosy in the United States.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3526. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes" approved December 17, 1914; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 4915. An act for the relief of Oliver C. Rice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 833. An act to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 6949. An act for the relief of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co., and the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6862. An act for the relief of Amos Dahuff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 6829. An act to provide for the disposition of public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the reclamation laws, and which are no longer needed in connection with said laws; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 6783. An act for the relief of William F. Carter; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 6737. An act for the relief of A. J. Lowary; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6730. An act to revoke authority to lease Sibley Island, in the Missouri River, to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 784. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Belton, Mont., for hotel purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 698. An act for the relief of John L. O'Mara; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 5344. An act for the regulation of the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 5504. An act for the relief of Louis Blanchette, alias Lewis Blanchard, alias Louis White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 391. An act for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand stamp patents, or otherwise; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4500. An act to incorporate the World's Sunday School Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3731. An act for the relief of John G. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5974. An act for the relief of Ellen B. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6671. An act to validate the homestead entries of Anna W. Thrailkill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 6692. An act to amend section 6 of an act to expedite the settlement of title to lands in the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4620. An act for the relief of James B. Smock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 6698. An act for the relief of Edward L. Keyes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Jacob Nice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1724. An act to reimburse the First National Bank of Owatonna, Minn., for revenue stamps stolen or lost in transit; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2292. An act to acquire the manuscript of Charles Chaillé-long, containing an account of the unveiling of the McClellan Statue; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 2461. An act authorizing the appointment of Bert R. Huntington as first lieutenant, Medical Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2512. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2704. An act for the relief of Albert L. Ream; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to grant the free use, for military drill, of rifles to duly accredited camps of the Sons of Veterans' Reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution authorizing an exhibition of the various activities of the Government service; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the code of international law proposed to the American Institute, now in session, for the purpose of securing the freedom of the seas for neutrals in time of war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, the river and harbor bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this is pension day, and while we are willing that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] should use the greater part of the day, yet we do not want to lose any of the rights of the Committee on Invalid Pensions or of the Committee on Pensions. If it can be understood and agreed that at a later hour in the day, say 5 o'clock, the bills on the calendar may be taken up and considered, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that at 5 o'clock pension bills be taken up.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Or immediately after the conclusion of the river and harbor bill.

Mr. MANN. Pension bills on the Private Calendar, to be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; to be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that at 5 o'clock pension bills on the Private Calendar shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. What is the request, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The request is that at the conclusion of this bill, if it is concluded before 5 o'clock—that is, the river and harbor bill—these pension bills on the Private Calendar shall be taken up for consideration, and if the river and harbor bill is not passed at 5 o'clock, or up to 5 o'clock, that these pension bills shall be taken up at 5 o'clock and be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman if he can not eliminate that restriction so as to take up the pension bills after the disposition of the river and harbor bill, no matter when that occurs?

The SPEAKER. That is the first half of the proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do not believe there will be difficulty in passing the river and harbor bill before 5 o'clock. But even if that contingency should not happen there would be opportunity to pass the pension bills after that.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have no objection to having the pension bills taken up after the passage of the river and harbor bill, with the understanding that they are the first thing in order after that bill is passed, if carried over until to-morrow—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman changes his request, and—

Mr. ASHBROOK. At the suggestion of the gentleman from Florida—

The SPEAKER. And asks that at the conclusion of the discussion of the river and harbor bill the private pension bills shall be in order and shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman mean that if the river and harbor bill is not concluded to-day he wants to take it up to-morrow?

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is what I desire.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have an appropriation bill ready, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is an appropriation bill ready for consideration to-morrow the first thing.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if that can not be agreed upon, I renew my original request as to 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that at 5 o'clock the private pension bills shall be taken up for consideration and that they shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. I think we had better make an arrangement to take up these bills at the conclusion of the river and harbor bill. In any event, it will only take a few minutes. There is every probability that we can get into the fortification bill to-day, notwithstanding that agreement.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there will be any trouble about it if we finish the river and harbor bill at 5 or 6 o'clock to-day.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We can not foresee just what may happen, and—

Mr. MANN. I think they will get through the river and harbor bill long before that.

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that we can stay here for the gentleman's bills, say, until 6 o'clock this evening.

Mr. ASHBROOK. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, that we will not be crowded out and lose our rights to-day, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Who is to understand?

Mr. MANN. Let the gentleman make the request that at the conclusion of the river and harbor bill to-day it shall be in order to consider pension bills in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Then I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the river and harbor bill to-day pension bills on the Private Calendar be in order, and be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the river and harbor bill to-day pension bills on the Private Calendar shall be in order, and that they shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FITZGERALD. To-day?

The SPEAKER. To-day.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. What will be the status of these bills if the river and harbor bill is not passed to-day?

Mr. MANN. The status will be that after the committee rises these bills will be in order.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is all right.

Mr. MANN. Whether the river and harbor bill is voted on to-day or not.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Now let us see what the request is.

Mr. MANN. That at the conclusion of the river and harbor bill to-day, whether it be by passage or by the committee rising, it shall be in order to take up pension bills on the Private Calendar, to be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The request is that when the discussion of the river and harbor bill to-day ceases these pension bills shall

be in order, and that they shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not understand that to be the request.

The SPEAKER. The request is that whenever you quit debating this river and harbor bill to-day, no difference whether you are through with the bill or not, these pension bills come up.

Mr. KITCHIN. To come up to-day, immediately afterwards.

The SPEAKER. Yes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRINTING.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, there are pending a number of bills that have been reported out by the Committee on Printing. Unfortunately, during the latter part of the last session of Congress the chairman of the Committee on Printing and one other member of the committee were unavoidably absent. There are 25 or 30 of these bills that ought to be passed. It will probably take an hour's time. I know the bills are privileged, but I would like to make some arrangement whereby we can take up these bills, and I would like to do it to-morrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That can not be done. The fortifications appropriation bill is ready, and it is necessary to consider appropriation bills as promptly as possible.

Mr. BARNHART. These printing bills are privileged.

Mr. FITZGERALD. So are the appropriation bills. If the gentleman wants to contest the question of considering printing bills against appropriation bills, he can do that. The failure of these printing bills will not interfere with the summer vacation of Congress, but the failure of appropriation bills will, and Members will bear that in mind.

Mr. MANN. The printing bills affect the convenience of every Member of the House. I think the chairman of the Committee on Printing ought to have his chance.

Mr. BARNHART. Some of these measures are concurrent resolutions, and they are as important as some of the appropriation bills in some respects.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; but the gentleman will undoubtedly have his chance.

Mr. BARNHART. The chairman of the Printing Committee has not asked to interrupt the proceedings at any time. If we do not get these bills through now, the probability is that later the Senate will have so much other business that it can not take care of them, and we will be left for the entire season. I think it is but fair to this committee, inasmuch as it has asked for no time and has not interrupted the proceedings of the House, that it be given time to consider these measures.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman might get a chance for a little while this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think we will get through with the river and harbor bill by 3 o'clock.

RIVERS AND HARBORS.

On motion of Mr. SPARKMAN, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 20079) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, with Mr. RAINEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WICKERSHAM: Page 39, line 13, after the end of line 13 insert as a new paragraph the following:

"Snake River Harbor, Nome, Alaska: Completing improvement in accordance with report submitted in House Document No. 1932, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, \$105,000."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, the river and harbor bill in the Sixty-third Congress carried an authorization for the survey of the Nome Harbor project. That survey has been made by the War Department and report made thereon. It is a favorable report, but it reached the Committee on Rivers and Harbors after this bill had been prepared and, as I understand, after it had been reported to the House, so the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had no opportunity to give consideration to the project, although it has been fully and favorably reported upon by the War Department, in accordance with the authorization contained in the bill passed in the last Congress.

I have moved to add to this bill the project as reported favorably by the War Department, and I appeal to the House to give favorable consideration to the matter and to hear me upon the importance of this project.

The Nome Harbor is a roadstead in front of the town of Nome. In other words, there is no harbor there. Vessels coming to the port of Nome are obliged to anchor a mile offshore, and all freight destined for Nome and the Seward Peninsula is

sent ashore in lighters. The town of Nome is at the mouth of the Snake River, and in the mouth of that river there is a good small harbor, but unfortunately there is no approach to it across the beach. The appropriation asked for in the amendment proposed is to open a passage across the beach into this well-protected harbor for the small vessels frequenting that port and for the entrance of steam lighters carrying freight from the ocean-going vessels at anchor a mile offshore. Of course, the opening of this channel to a depth of only 8 or 10 feet will not admit the larger vessels, but will expedite the unloading of these with steam lighters, which can thus run into the harbor and unload, and save them from the expense and danger of unloading on the shallow beach by cranes or otherwise. It will also afford a safe harbor for small vessels in case of storms. But on account of the sand bars along the beach there is no opportunity for vessels to get into Nome Harbor until the sand is cleared away and a passage made for the entrance of vessels. We asked for a much larger appropriation than has been allowed by the War Department for this work. We went before the Board on Rivers and Harbors and tried to induce them to give us a larger amount, but in their wisdom the board limited us to \$105,000.

The people of Alaska have no complaint to make in respect to the way the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has treated that Territory. Every time we have presented a project before that committee it has met the fairest consideration, and I think without exception we have received what we have asked for. I am satisfied that if the report of the War Department in this case had reached the committee in time it would have been favorably acted upon and the project would have been in the bill, but unfortunately the report was late.

However fairly the River and Harbor Committee has treated Alaska, Alaska has also treated the committee fairly, because we have never had but two projects and two small appropriations for river or harbor improvements in the Territory. Alaska, with its magnificent harbors and great waterways, has asked very little from Congress and has always received that little promptly and with the very fairest possible treatment.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Can the gentleman give the amount of traffic in Nome Harbor?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And also will the gentleman state how far this bar extends out?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The bar does not extend very far; it is a sand bar, but it extends far enough to close the opening into Snake River Harbor. It is easily removed.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But it will need some revetment?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. We need a jetty on each side.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Is there any tide there, and if so, how much?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The tide is very small, only a few inches, but we have heavy storms along that shore.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It is for the want of a tide to keep the bar out?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; to a great extent.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How deep is the channel there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. We want an 8 or 10 foot channel; we only have light-draft vessels, and we only need a fair channel to enable steam lighters and smaller vessels to get in. When a storm arises now, the large vessels, as well as the small ones, have to run 15 miles beyond Nome to get behind Sledge Island for safety.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How large is the natural harbor at the mouth of Snake River?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is not very large, but sufficient for all small vessels that go to that port if the entrance could be cleaned out and protected by jetties.

Now, I am asked to state something about the trade of Nome. Nome was opened in 1898, when the gold strike was made on the Seward Peninsula. From that time to this large quantities of gold have been extracted from the sand, even on this beach, and also behind it on the ancient beaches now covered in the tundra. Many millions of dollars have been extracted from these sands, and large amounts of merchandise have gone to the port for that work. These shipments have had to be landed from vessels anchored a mile offshore by the use of lighters. In 1915 the merchandise landed at Nome amounted to \$1,110,345. In the seven years, 1909 to 1915, inclusive, the merchandise to Nome, lightered to shore from vessels anchored in the sea, amounted to \$8,448,522, or more than \$1,200,000 per annum.

The gold output from Nome, going out over this same beach in lighters to vessels anchored a mile away, amounted last year to \$2,900,000, and in the seven years from 1910 to 1916, both inclusive, it amounted to \$20,623,335, or nearly \$3,000,000 per annum.

The following table gives the value of the imports of merchandise to Nome alone for the seven years 1909 to 1915, both inclusive, and the export of gold from the Seward Peninsula for the years 1910 to 1916, both inclusive:

	Merchandise.	Gold.
1909.....	\$1,701,623	
1910.....	1,145,758	\$3,699,674
1911.....	1,050,903	3,246,498
1912.....	1,279,396	3,135,881
1913.....	1,223,599	2,239,057
1914.....	926,808	2,602,273
1915.....	1,110,345	2,795,952
1916.....		2,900,000
Total.....	8,448,522	20,623,335

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The merchandise landed at Nome is not all of the merchandise shipped to the Seward Peninsula. But all of the Nome merchandise is lightered to shore at large expense. It costs \$4 or \$5 additional for lightering. That would not all be taken off if this project was completed, but very largely it would be; there would probably be a saving of \$2 or \$3 a ton on all merchandise going to the Seward Peninsula if this project was completed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If I remember correctly, the purpose of this improvement is not only for the benefit of commerce by greatly reducing the charges, but also it gives a safe place for the smaller vessels to enter in case of storm.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; to all that go up and down the coast. There is no harbor within 20 miles of Nome on each side. If a storm rises, a vessel has to run to Sledge Island, 15 miles away, to get in a zone of safety.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. This improvement is to a large extent, then, for a harbor of refuge?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; many small vessels have been piled up on the beach in front of Nome, the value of which would more than build this harbor. Many vessels of that kind have gone ashore, large losses in property have occurred, and many lives have been lost for the want of this harbor.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How much of the year is the harbor free from ice?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. For five months.

I hold in my hand a report made by the Geological Survey on the Seward Peninsula. The report says:

The value of the gold output of Seward Peninsula in 1916 was about \$2,900,000, which is the same as that of 1915. In addition to this, stream tin and tungsten and antimony ore were produced to the value of about \$100,000.

Twenty-nine gold dredges were operated on the peninsula in 1916, seven in the Nome district, four in the Solomon River district, nine in the Council district, four in the Port Clarence district, three in the Fairhaven district, and two in the Kongarok district. In addition two tin dredges were worked in the York district. About 65 deep placer mines and 30 open-cut plants were operated on the peninsula during 1916. One of the notable events of the year was the development of the placers on Dime Creek, in the Koyuk district, in the southeastern part of the peninsula. The summer output of this new district has not yet been learned, but the product of the winter's mining, which was carried on by eight plants, was \$100,000. These placers carry considerable platinum. The only other place on the peninsula where platinum has been reported is in the placers of Bear Creek, in the Fairhaven district.

Besides the tin, tungsten, and antimony mining on Seward Peninsula, already described, there was considerable prospecting of copper and gold lodes. Some graphite was also mined and shipped from the Port Clarence district.

There is enough placer sands at and near Nome to employ thousands of miners with dredges and other machinery for an indefinite term—for a long period of years—if facilities for transportation and safe and cheap landings can be provided. This project is intended to be a permanent improvement, one of the best improvements that could possibly be made for the development of that mineral-bearing peninsula. Its miners have taken out in seven years more than \$20,000,000, and much more prior to that time. I hope this committee will consider this project as an independent proposition and as one that is immediately necessary and of great benefit to our people. I am sure the Committee on Rivers and Harbors would have favorably reported this project if the report had been made in time, but, unfortunately for us, we could not get it before the committee until this bill had been reported. The whole trade of Alaska is much more with the United States than the trade of China. In the last three years the trade of Alaska with the United States has amounted to more than

\$70,000,000 per annum, whereas the trade with China is not nearly so much.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is that trade with Alaska growing or decreasing?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is a growing trade, and would increase more rapidly at this point if this project can be secured.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I might suggest that the trade with China is constantly decreasing.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That may be true; but that with Alaska is rapidly increasing, as the following comparative statement will show.

The following table shows the total imports and exports of Alaska for the years 1913, 1914, and 1915, and also the total imports and exports for the same period between the United States and China and the Philippines:

Country.	Years.	Imports.	Exports.	Total.
China.....	1913	\$40,120,826	\$25,299,802	\$65,420,628
	1914	36,313,770	20,367,701	56,681,471
	1915	52,837,503	19,752,824	72,590,327
Total, 3 years.....		129,272,099	65,420,327	194,692,426
Philippine Islands.....	1913	26,676,261	16,434,018	43,110,279
	1914	24,020,395	24,427,710	48,448,105
	1915	26,381,069	23,653,211	50,034,280
Total, 3 years.....		77,077,725	64,514,939	141,592,664
Alaska.....	1913	26,761,848	40,767,677	67,529,525
	1914	25,849,944	44,655,924	70,505,868
	1915	28,017,307	54,856,815	82,874,122
Total, 3 years.....		80,629,099	140,280,416	220,909,515

Mr. SHERWOOD. What is the population of Nome?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. About 5,000, and of the Seward Peninsula about 7,000. The miners of the Seward Peninsula take out more placer gold from these sands and produce more per capita than any other group of miners in American territory. It is a very rich gold country. In answer to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] permit me to say that the total trade of Alaska with United States merchants exceeds the total trade and commerce of the United States with China or the Philippines or any other country in Asia, excepting only British India and Japan. It exceeds that of every country in South America, excepting only Argentina and Brazil. It exceeds that in every country in North America, except Canada, Mexico, and Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska has expired.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman be able to conclude in those five minutes?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, the trade of Alaska with the United States is greater than the total trade between the United States and all countries on the African continent. Its trade with the United States is constantly increasing and is national in character. Alaska is the best customer the United States has in four continents, for every dollar in the Alaskan trade, both imports and exports, is an American dollar. There is no balance of trade against the United States in either direction. Every dollar flowing into or out of the United States in the Alaskan trade helps to increase the trade in the labor products of the whole United States and in developing the great natural resources of our common country.

The total amount of merchandise purchased in Alaska from merchants of the United States since its acquisition in 1867 amounts to \$331,072,778. In that period the people engaged in developing Alaska have paid into the United States Treasury for internal revenue, customs, public lands, and other public dues the sum of \$17,787,153. Alaska has produced more than 47 per cent of all the canned or other fish marketed from the Pacific coast, including Canadian waters. The value of the Alaskan fish and fur trade since 1867 now amounts to some \$326,083,246. Alaska's mineral products for the same period amounts to the sum of \$351,000,000.

Credit Alaska with her cash trade value since 1867:

Merchandise imported from the United States	\$331,072,778
Cash paid into the United States Treasury	17,787,153
Production of fish and furs	326,083,246
Mineral production	351,000,000

Total trade value of Alaska since 1867..... 1,025,943,177

Charge Alaska with all national expenditures:

Purchase price paid to Russia	\$7,200,000
Treasury Department expenditures, 1867-1916	43,904,681
Commerce Department expenditures, 1867-1916	7,271,657
Interior Department expenditures, 1867-1916	8,127,810
Agriculture Department expenditures, 1867-1916	859,934
Justice Department expenditures, 1867-1916	8,394,676
Navy Department expenditures, 1867-1916	1,146,665
War Department expenditures, 1867-1916	24,373,702
Labor Department expenditures, 1867-1916	76,068

Total national expenditures account of Alaska..... 101,355,193

Trade balance due Alaska..... 924,587,984

The trade of Alaska with the United States for 1915 exceeded \$82,000,000; that for 1916 will exceed \$100,000,000; if that for 1917 shall be as large, the total trade balance due Alaska on October 18, 1917, the date of the semicentennial of its purchase from Russia, will exceed \$1,000,000,000 over and beyond all the national expenditures made in its purchase, government, and development.

In other words, Alaska has brought into the channels of trade in the United States in production and trade more than a billion dollars since we purchased it in 1867, and that trade is growing, it is increasing every year. We have received in those 50 years for river and harbor improvements less than \$250,000, and we now appeal to this House and to the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors especially, to help this Territory by including this project with its small appropriation for the building of one of the most needed harbors in Alaska Territory. I hope the committee will give us this project, because it is so important to us, and it will not tend in any way to open the door to a flood of other projects, which the chairman of the committee is probably justly afraid of. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think there is no question but that this item would have been included in the bill if the report had been received in time. I do not think that time is the essence of putting these projects in the bill. As has been already pointed out to you, the purpose of this improvement is to get 6½ feet of water at Nome, not only for the purpose of commerce but in order to furnish a harbor of refuge for those small vessels that have no other place to go in that portion of the sea. It very frequently happens that there are a number of vessels in that vicinity. No one will object on the merits of the proposition, and I think that we ought to put it in, although it was not received by the committee in time. It lacked only a few days and it was not due to the negligence of any one. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] secured the report as soon as he could. I know that I would have gotten it at the very earliest moment myself. I do not think that we can afford to be niggardly with the people of Alaska. When we consider the fact that during this last year that great Territory that cost us \$7,200,000 has produced in wealth over \$100,000,000 we can well afford to give them a few dollars to improve this harbor.

Let me call your attention for a moment to the conditions at Nome. They have a town which during the summer time has a population of about 7,000 people, and it has been estimated by the great English engineer, Mr. Richardson, that in the sand of Nome, along that beach in front of Nome itself, will be found a billion dollars in gold. That little stretch of sand is about 25 miles long and from 2 to 3 miles wide. If it runs at the rate of 25 cents a cubic yard there will be more than a billion dollars, and so far it has averaged over 50 cents a cubic yard, so there is at Nome a permanent community which as long as any of us will live, and years afterwards, will be taking out gold. I do not think that the House ought to hesitate a moment because this report was late in being received in giving this appropriation.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a friendly inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. As bearing upon the log proposition, which was debated at some considerable length in the House yesterday, will it be possible to so arrange that the Government might get the gold taken out of the Snake River in making the improvement—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. How is that?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. This improvement involves the removal of sand in the Snake River in making this harbor improvement?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Unfortunately, let me say, the gentleman from Massachusetts made the point of order.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In view of the great wealth of that sand there it might be that the Government might actually be a gainer on this proposition.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, it might be.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. How much is proposed to be appropriated by this amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. One hundred and five thousand dollars.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Does that complete it?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That completes the entire project. The Government engineers report says that it ought to be all appropriated at once, so it can be done economically and be hurried along. They have a short season, as the gentleman knows, there for doing work, and it ought to be appropriated at one time. That is also sufficient for the maintenance for an additional year.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the report also requires the people of Nome to give a certain amount—I think \$12,500.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; it requires the co-operation on the part of the people there also.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Which they have agreed to do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the only objection that I could possibly have to this amendment is that the committee has not had time to consider it thoroughly as we usually consider such matters. The report came in after the bill was reported, and, although its date is some five days before the introduction of this bill, it was not received until a few days after the introduction of the bill in the House. On its face it appears to be a good proposition, a meritorious recommendation, and if it had come to us in time I have no doubt but what we would have inserted it in this bill. One objection now to it is the one just stated by the gentleman from Alaska, that it might open the door to other similar amendments, and for that reason we have heretofore strenuously objected to accepting amendments of this kind on the floor. I am going to leave this matter, however, entirely to the committee, believing if it is voted in the committee can protect us against any other similar amendments. I wish, however, to read the last paragraph of the report of the Chief of Engineers which is quite favorable. He says:

After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports—

That is the reports of the district and division engineers and the Board of Engineers—

I concur in the views of the district office, the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and therefore report that the improvement by the United States of mouth of Snake River and Nome Harbor, Alaska, is deemed advisable to the extent of dredging a basin in Snake River, with a connecting channel to Norton Sound 75 feet wide on the bottom and 8 feet deep at mean lower low water, revetting the banks of the river and constructing two jetties at the mouth, approximately as shown on accompanying map, except that the distance between jetties be increased as suggested by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, all at an estimated cost of \$95,000 for first construction, \$13,500 for maintenance the first year, and \$7,500 per annum thereafter, provided that the city of Nome will furnish evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of War that it will contribute \$2,500 annually toward the maintenance of the improvement and furnish all lands or easements necessary to the proper execution of the work. The first appropriation should be \$105,000, covering the entire cost of construction, and the Government's share of the first year's maintenance.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment reported again. I want to see if the conditions imposed by the report are included in it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is to be adopted at all it should be adopted subject to the conditions set forth in said report.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to add to the amendment which I have proposed these words, "And subject to the conditions set forth in said document."

Mr. MANN. Where is that?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is to be added to the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is to go before the amount, "subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$105,000." That is the way it should read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the addition to the amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after line 13, page 39, the following as a new paragraph:
"Snake River Harbor, Nome, Alaska: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1932, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$105,000."

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be agreed to—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. There has been no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. My understanding was there was objection. I do not want to start anything by advocating the amendment. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pawtucket River, R. I., with a view to increasing the width of channel through the ledge near Pawtucket.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS: Page 41, after line 8, insert:
"Sterling Basin at Greenpoint, N. Y., with a view of securing adequate width."

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inland water route along the southern shore of Long Island, N. Y., from Jamaica Bay to Peconic Bay, with a view to providing a channel of adequate width and depth.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment by Mr. BURGESS: Page 41, after line 11, insert:
"Flushing Bay, N. Y."

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Smith Creek, Pamlico County, N. C.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, line 12, change the word "Smith" to "Smiths."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of a navigable waterway, of suitable depth and width to answer the needs of commerce, connecting the waters of the Flint and Ocmulgee Rivers in the State of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment by Mr. BURGESS: Amend, on page 42, after line 21, by inserting:

"Ashley River S. C., from the Standard Wharf to the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co. to Lambs, with a view of improving the channel to a depth of not less than 8 feet."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Savannah River at and near Augusta, Ga., for the purpose of determining what additional improvement is necessary, if any, in the interest of flood protection; also the consideration of any proposition for co-operation on the part of local or State interests.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Some time ago we created what is called the Flood Control Committee, or something of that sort. There was considerable discussion in the House at that time, coming partly from the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], who became chairman of that committee, and partly from the various members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which he was

then a member, in regard to what jurisdiction the Flood Control Committee would have. This bill, I think, for the first time carries a number of items in it in language in regard to flood control. Having created a new committee of the House for the purpose of studying protection against floods, thereupon the Committee on Rivers and Harbors inaugurates the policy of including the same character of items in the river and harbor bill. What is the use of the Flood Control Committee? I suppose every member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors asks that question. We carry in the item a provision for flood control on the Mississippi River without any contribution from the local interests.

The flood bill that passed the House provided for contributions from the local interests. That was seriously attacked by various gentlemen on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, because they said it would not require sufficient contribution from such interests. So they bring in a bill requiring no contribution from the local interests. I wanted to inquire just how far it is the intention of the Rivers and Harbors Committee to go along the line of protection from flood, in the hope that I could at least get a statement either from the distinguished chairman of the Flood Control Committee or the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Is it the purpose of the two committees to simply overlap each other's jurisdiction, or is it the intention of either committee to make any pretense of remaining within the bounds of its own jurisdiction?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that that amendment be reported again.

Mr. MANN. There was no amendment. I reserved the point of order on the paragraph providing for investigation relating to flood protection on the Savannah River. I shall not make the point of order, because I did not make a point of order on other items of a similar character in the bill, but I would like to know how far it is the intention of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to go along the lines of flood protection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to answer the question so far as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is concerned. The reason we insert the Savannah River item, and, if there are others, the reason for inserting them, is that it may be developed that an improvement of that kind is in the interest of navigation. But, independent of that, it seems that the Committee on Flood Protection has no authority to make appropriations and that about the only way these investigations can be made is to have some committee authorize the investigation which has the authority to make appropriations to have the work done. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, having that authority, having jurisdiction generally of the subject matter of the improvement of rivers, we thought that committee was a proper one, if not the only one, to make these authorizations.

Now, it is true that heretofore we have been very careful about inserting provisions in the river and harbor bill authorizing surveys for work in the interest of flood protection, but since the creation of the Committee on Flood Protection we have felt at liberty to go a little further than we had heretofore been going. Hence this provision regarding the Savannah River and perhaps some others may be found in that part of the bill containing surveys. That, I believe, is an answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The question as to the jurisdiction of the two committees was thrashed out very fully at the time the Flood Control Committee was organized. I was interested in ascertaining what point of order the gentleman from Illinois made, but I do not propose to ask him now. I assume he would have made the point of order on the ground—

Mr. STAFFORD. There may be some others here that will make the point of order. It is still pending.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (continuing). That this matter was not properly before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I want to ask the gentleman this—

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield, but it is not my time.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it not true that the Flood Control Committee has only control over the Mississippi and the Sacramento Rivers?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Up to date that is all—

Mr. BOOHER. Is not its action confined to those two rivers?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think not, according to the understanding at the time the Flood Control Committee was formed.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was no limit whatsoever.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The only bill brought in by the Flood Control Committee and considered by the House was one pertaining to the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers.

What I want to ask the gentleman from Florida is this: The Flood Control Committee has not power to appropriate, it can only authorize an appropriation. It has not had an opportunity to pass upon this particular matter. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, therefore, has gone along in the usual way to provide for such rivers as it thinks it should provide for, in the matter of navigation, whether it involves the controlling of floods or not. Is not that the fact?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has simply performed the functions assigned to it and has exercised its jurisdiction in this instance, pending whatever may happen as to the Committee on Flood Control when it gets into action. As the Savannah River is a navigable stream, and the Flood Control Committee not being in the harness to meet the situation, as it were, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is meeting the emergency?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is it; and I would say further, Mr. Chairman, that if this survey should develop the fact that the only improvement needed there is flood protection and not for navigation, it would go to the Committee on Flood Control for authorization. I am quite sure the Committee on Rivers and Harbors would not claim jurisdiction under those circumstances.

Now, the item reads:

Savannah River at and near Augusta, Ga., for the purpose of determining what additional improvement is necessary, if any, in the interest of flood protection; also the consideration of any proposition for cooperation on the part of local or State interests.

I think that this committee has jurisdiction of just such propositions as that under the circumstances. It might have been worded a little differently. For instance, it might have read, "necessary in the interest of navigation and flood protection," and I am perfectly willing to offer this amendment: After the word "of," on line 3, insert the words "navigation and," which I fancy will remove the trouble.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order is pending. The amendment can not be considered until the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is a point of order pending? I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made a point of order and then withdrew it.

The CHAIRMAN. He reserved it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the point of order is still reserved?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the reservation of the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin renews the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that the point of order having been made, and discussion having ensued thereon, it is too late now to make a new point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the facts are these: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made a reservation of the point of order. During the discussion on the reservation he said he did not intend to press the point of order, but he did not, up to that time, and not until a moment ago, withdraw the reservation. Of course, no one had a right to interrupt the gentleman from Illinois when he said he did not intend to press the point of order. It was still pending under the parliamentary procedure of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as I recall the facts, they are these: The gentleman from Illinois rose and reserved a point of order. There was discussion under the reservation of the point of order. The gentleman from Illinois took his seat, indicating that he did not intend to make the point of order. Then there was discussion. Then the Chairman's attention being called to the fact and the attention of the gentleman from Illinois being called to the fact, the gentleman from Illinois made the declaration that he had withdrawn the point of order. Then the gentleman from Wisconsin made his point, whereupon I contended he came too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserved the point of order, and at the close of his remarks he withdrew

the point of order, and the reservation was renewed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. There was no withdrawal of the point of order on this paragraph. The point of order is pending on this paragraph, and it will be reserved on the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very clear that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has no jurisdiction of this matter, and they have never before undertaken to exercise that jurisdiction. The committee has, in fact, always refused to entertain amendments of this character up until now. The Senate Committee on Commerce, which has a broader jurisdiction than the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, has during the past two or three years incorporated in the bill when it got to the Senate amendments providing for surveys looking to the control of floods in the various streams of the country, and those amendments were agreed to in conference, and therefore carried in the river and harbor bill. But this is the first time that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, as I understand it, has ever undertaken itself to exercise this jurisdiction.

Now, the reason I, as chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, made no point against it is this: That committee, as you know, is a new committee. We undertook last year in the bill that we passed to create the machinery whereby flood problems throughout the country could be properly investigated. Under the law as it stands to-day when these investigations are made the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors must, in making their report, limit their recommendations to the question of navigation, and unless the project is considered worthy in view of navigation interests the report is unfavorable. This bill that we passed through the House from the Flood Control Committee would broaden the power and scope of the engineers in their investigations, and in making their recommendations to Congress they would not be limited to the sole question of the navigation interests, but any other Federal interest might be involved in it. But that bill has not yet become a law.

Now, with that bill pending in the Senate but never having been enacted into law, the Flood Control Committee was just in this attitude: We were unable to give any relief to gentlemen who sought surveys for the purpose of investigating flood problems. We were unable to do it ourselves, and, whereas the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had no jurisdiction of the subject matter, if we made a point of order against it it meant simply that nothing would be done.

For that reason as chairman of the committee I did not raise the point. There can be, I think, no question but that the Flood Control Committee has exclusive jurisdiction of the subject matter and that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has no jurisdiction whatever.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill carries two items heretofore carried for the relief of the Mississippi and the Sacramento Rivers. I realize the doubt as to the passage through the Senate of the flood-control bill. I did not make any point of order against either of these propositions, thinking they were matters that should be continued. Now here we have a new policy. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether he thinks it proper, in view of the fact that his committee is charged with the full consideration of the subject, to have another committee single out one or two items relating to flood control, and whether it is conducive to good legislation?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I do not think I would like to answer that question, except to say that I believe the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has no jurisdiction of the subject matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. But has the committee of which the gentleman is chairman given consideration to the question of surveys of various projects?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes, we have. There are a number pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will not this be a case of singling out some projects and barring others that are being considered by the Committee on Flood Control?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The Committee on Flood Control has before it, I think, 10 reports on preliminary surveys that were ordered in the river and harbor bill, by virtue of amendments put on in the Senate two years ago; but as I say, we have no machinery in the War Department by which we can make these investigations until this flood-control bill passes the Senate. We have the jurisdiction but we have no organized court. We have no sheriff to execute our orders.

Mr. VINSON. I should like to ask the gentleman if this provision in the river and harbor bill to which the point of order has been made would not, by obtaining this survey,

facilitate the work before the Flood Control Committee on this same subject.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly it would expedite it.

Mr. VINSON. Otherwise, as the flood-control bill is on a slow road to passage in the Senate, it means that these projects, which may be meritorious, must be held in abeyance, does it not?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I think so. Nevertheless, it is a matter over which the Rivers and Harbors Committee have no jurisdiction.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the committee of which the gentleman is chairman has given consideration to surveys of various flood-control projects?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. As I stated, we have a number before us. We have just been waiting until the Senate acts on the flood-control bill, to see whether they will pass the bill creating the machinery in the War Department whereby all these surveys can be made. We have just been waiting for the Senate to act. If the Senate acts, I think our committee is ready to act on the various propositions for surveys now pending in the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not within the province of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to report items providing for flood control.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to have the Clerk report the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is not an amendment; it is a paragraph in the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. There was an amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. But a point of order was pending. It could not be offered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand no amendment is permissible until the point of order is disposed of.

Mr. EDWARDS. An amendment could be offered by unanimous consent, could it not?

The CHAIRMAN. It could be offered by unanimous consent.

Mr. EDWARDS. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee may be considered pending. I would like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that this is an important matter to the section affected. There is no conflict between the Committee on Flood Control and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The chairman of the Committee on Flood Control has explained the situation, and so has the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. This item affects most largely the district represented by my colleague [Mr. VINSON]. He is on the Flood Control Committee. There is no desire on the part of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to appropriate any of the functions and powers of any other committee, and no particular objection has come from anybody on the Flood Control Committee. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the amendment offered by the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee be considered pending, which will obviate the point of order; and I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will not interpose any objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would not obviate the point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think it would.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say to the gentleman that it would not; but, reserving the point, I will ask the gentleman if he will yield to me, to allow me to ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is another item in the bill subject to a like point of order, relating to some flood-control arrangements between the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, of the waters along the boundaries of those States. I wish to make an inquiry which is rather out of order, but my position will be guided somewhat by the purpose to be covered by that survey. Of course, there is no navigation connected with the proposal as found on page 45. It is purely a flood-control proposition.

Mr. SMALL. In answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I will say that this is a proposition which has been pending for some time between those States. They wish to enter into a compact, and under the Constitution it requires the consent of Congress to do so. They wish to enter into a compact with a view of making an agreement relative to certain boundary streams, as well as their tributaries, which go through these States to some extent, with a view to their improvement for flood protection as well as navigation. They propose to coop-

erate in furnishing the money for the investigation and to pay the entire expense of the improvement if upon a survey such improvement shall be deemed advisable. The purpose of this is simply to authorize them to enter into a compact and to authorize the Secretary of War to make this investigation in order to determine its advisability.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire of the gentleman from Texas having charge of the committee amendments for surveys whether it is proposed to offer any committee amendment looking to a survey which embodies the policy of flood control?

Mr. BURGESS. I think not.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is inquiring about the Minnesota-North Dakota-South Dakota proposition?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. When that item is reached, we have a substitute to offer for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to play favorites, but I do wish to avoid a conflict of jurisdiction of committees. If these are the only two items I am ready, with the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia, to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SMALL. I will say that there is to be no other amendment offered along that line.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 43, line 3, by inserting, after the word "of," the words "navigation and of."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 42, line 16, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to return to page 42, line 16, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, let the amendment first be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, after line 16, insert:

"Lynchs River, S. C."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Withlacoochee River, Fla., between Dunnellon and Lake Panasoffkee.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On yesterday I offered an amendment on page 32 in this bill, after line 11, in effect preventing the impounding of water above the Keokuk Dam in the Mississippi River. The situation there is simply intolerable. Boats are being held up for hours in order that this company may pay the dividends it thinks it ought to pay. I do not want to insist on that amendment at this time—the Committee on Rivers and Harbors would have jurisdiction of any resolution that I might submit on that question—if the chairman will assure me that if I introduce a resolution of that kind the committee will find some time during the session to consider it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has ample jurisdiction to make that investigation. After this bill is completed I probably shall not be here for the next two weeks, but there are other members of the committee who can and will be able to take the matter up and make the necessary investigation. I am authorized to say that.

Mr. RAINEY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 32, line 11, for the purpose of withdrawing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to return to page 32, line 11, and withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hillsboro River, Fla., from Michigan Avenue to Lafayette Street Bridge, Tampa.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 19, page 43, after the word "Tampa," by inserting:

"Back Bay of Biloxi, Miss., with a view to removing shoals at Cranes Neck and Biloxi mud flats and securing a depth of 12 feet."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bayou Tigre, La.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, after line 20, insert:
"Bayou Tennebonne between Houma and Thibodaux."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 43, after line 20, insert:
"Bayou Dorcheat, La., through Lake Bistineau and Loggy Bayou."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Intracoastal waterway from Calcasieu River, La., to Sabine River, Tex. and La., with a view to securing such width and depth as will meet the demands of commerce.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph for the purpose of inquiring what an intracoastal waterway is, whether it is the same as would ordinarily be known as a canal? It seems to me that it is beyond the jurisdiction of the River and Harbor Committee if it is a canal. I am not sure as to it, and therefore I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it might or might not involve the construction of a canal, but according to my understanding the waterway in that particular locality does not and will not involve the construction of a canal.

Mr. TREADWAY. It does not involve the construction of a canal?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does not is my understanding.

Mr. BURGESS. It does not involve the construction of a canal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is merely an improvement of an intracoastal waterway already existing.

Mr. TREADWAY. The waterway is there, and the idea is to get a greater depth of natural waterway?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lake Bluff Harbor, Ill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, after line 23, insert:
"Pentwater Harbor, Mich."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURGESS. Also the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "Lake Bluff Harbor, Ill.," in line 25, page 44, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Bar in Lake Michigan in front of United States Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill., with a view to dredging said bar so as to permit lake vessels to land at said station."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of War is authorized to make such preliminary examinations as can be made from available data without making field surveys, touching the creation of conditions in or paralleling the St. Lawrence River from its head to tidewater, suitable in all respects for navigation by ocean-going ships, including such approximate estimate of cost of improvement as can be predicated on such available data, and an approximation of the amount of power, if any, that would be incident thereto.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order. I would like to know what we have to do with the St. Lawrence River over on the Canadian side?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this item was presented to the committee by a member of the committee, Mr. GALLAGHER, of Chicago, and behind him were certain gentlemen of the same city who were reputed to be men of intelligence and affairs there.

Mr. MANN. But that has nothing to do with the item. What does it mean?

Mr. SMALL. And we were told that the business interests of the country would be subserved by securing this information. It requires no surveys. It requires only an examination of available data, and while the gentleman's observation that we have nothing to do with the St. Lawrence River is correct, yet that data, as it was represented to us, would be valuable in determining certain improvements within our own country and in the section of the Great Lakes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this requires an examination.

Touching the creation of conditions in or paralleling the St. Lawrence River from its head to tide water, suitable in all respects for navigation by ocean-going ships.

In the first place, it is exceedingly poor language; it is not grammatical. What it means the gentleman from North Carolina may know, but I can not understand without an explanation.

Mr. SMALL. The item was submitted to the Chief of Engineers and the final draft of it had the approval of the Board of Engineers.

Mr. MANN. They are not supposed to be expert grammarians like the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SMALL. Nor like the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. What have we to do with it? What is the purpose of it? To provide for a report upon a canal from Lake Erie paralleling the St. Lawrence River, to be constructed by the Government of the United States through Canadian territory?

Mr. SMALL. It was assumed that this information would have to be obtained from official records of the Dominion of Canada, from such information as was available to every one, or from such information as would be furnished upon application by our Government. I will be candid and say that the exact relationship to the waterways of our own country was not made entirely clear to us, but representations were made that the information which would be developed by the study and the coordination of the same would be of value to the United States. That is as clear as I can put it at this time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the position of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] who believe that we ought to have an intracoastal waterway running from Boston down the Atlantic coast, going across Florida and running across the Gulf coast to the farther end of the Texas coast line, but do I understand the gentleman to think that it is necessary to supplement that by a canal paralleling the St. Lawrence River?

Mr. SMALL. If I were to answer the query of the gentleman I would say that so far as I know it has no reference or connection, direct or indirect, to or with any intracoastal waterway in the United States.

Mr. MANN. Is it necessary to have a canal paralleling the St. Lawrence River?

Mr. SMALL. That necessity would probably appear from the information which will be obtained as the result of this item.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman may think so. I do not think it is the business of the United States to build a canal through Canadian territory paralleling the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. SMALL. I would remind the gentleman that this item had its inception in the city of Chicago, and, of course, he will not admit that anything wrong could proceed from that city.

Mr. MANN. That is the only argument the gentleman has yet offered in favor of it, and while a great many good things emanate from Chicago, some people think that everything there is not entirely pure. I make the point of order against the paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order against the paragraph. The Chair does not think—

Mr. SMALL. What is the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Oh, that it is not within the privilege of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to report propositions of this kind in reference to constructing a canal nor in reference to improving the St. Lawrence River on Canadian soil.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is not clear to my mind that the paragraph is subject to a point of order. A part of that river is in the United States and it is a navigable stream and to that extent this committee has jurisdiction of it. I care, myself, very little about the possession. As has been stated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], it was inserted at the request of other parties, and it was not made very clear just why it was needed; but, as he also stated, the Chief of Engineers thought that the information called for and which is to be gathered from data already at hand without necessity for instrumental surveys, would be of use to the Congress and to the department; hence it was inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors does not have sufficient jurisdiction to authorize the investigation of conditions on the St. Lawrence River elsewhere than in the territory of the United States. This paragraph is not limited to data that may be in existence now in the office of the Chief of Engineers, but authorizes the

Secretary of War to compile available data without making any surveys, touching conditions in or parallel with the St. Lawrence River outside of the United States. The Chair thinks it is subject to the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of War may, in his discretion, cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made of any river or rivers situated within or along the boundaries of the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, to be designated by the governors of each of said States, for the purpose of improving navigation or of preventing or controlling flood waters therein, and may accept contributions of local funds for use in making said investigations. If a favorable report shall be submitted with plans for such improvement and estimates of cost, the said States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota are hereby authorized to enter into an agreement or compact with each other for the purpose of providing the necessary funds in such proportions as may be agreed upon between said States for the purpose of executing such works of improvement, and when the necessary funds therefor shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, the Secretary of War is hereby directed, under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, to construct and complete such works of improvement.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let the amendment be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina will be read for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 12 to 25, both inclusive, on page 45, and lines 1 to 5, both inclusive, on page 46, and insert in lieu thereof the following, to wit:

"That the Congress consents that the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, or any two of them, may enter into any agreement or agreements or compacts with each other to improve navigation and to lessen and prevent floods on boundary waters of said States and the waters tributary thereto, and said States, or any two of them, are authorized to and may, with the approval of the Secretary of War, make such improvements.

"The Secretary of War is authorized to make a survey of any project proposed by the governors of said States, or any two of them, to determine the feasibility thereof and the expenses of carrying the same into effect, and what share of such expenses should be borne by the different States, local interests, or by the National Government; and he may accept contributions of local funds for use in making such investigations. If the Secretary of War approves any such project, and said States, or any two of them, consent thereto, he is hereby authorized to make such improvements under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, provided the necessary funds therefor are furnished by said States, or either of them, or from any other source."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the draft of the amendment proposed as a substitute was submitted by two gentlemen from Minnesota, Mr. VOLSTEAD and Mr. STEENERSON. Deeming the language in the substitute more appropriate than the language in the bill, and in deference to their judgment, the committee were entirely willing to adopt the substitute agreeable to the gentlemen from Minnesota, whom we understood also represent as to the approval of this substitute the gentlemen from North and South Dakota.

The committee has no objection to the substitute and I move that it be adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has been read and I would like to have the gentleman from Minnesota make some explanation of the purpose of it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, in order to establish a reason for this legislation it will be necessary to call attention to the fact that for 280 miles the boundary between Minnesota and the two States of North and South Dakota consists of lakes and rivers. The State of Minnesota being the oldest State early undertook a general system of drainage and reclamation of overflowed land and thousands of miles of ditches were constructed, especially in the valley of the Red River and in the vicinity of Lakes Big Stone and Traverse. Those two lakes are boundary waters about 30 miles in length each. The States of South Dakota and North Dakota also a little later, as soon as their lands were settled and the Indian titles extinguished, drained into these boundary waters.

In the last two or three years, however, owing probably to the fact that the rains have been heavy, large tracts of land which formerly had been rich agricultural lands and been under cultivation were overflowed in the vicinity of Lake Traverse, on both sides of the lake, both on the Minnesota and on the South Dakota and North Dakota sides, and large tracts along the Red River of the North were also overflowed. These lands were cultivated and were rich farming lands. Last summer the States of North Dakota and South Dakota brought two original actions or suits in the Supreme Court of the United

States against Minnesota in which it is claimed that the State of Minnesota through its municipalities and through its direct authority had diverted the surface waters from their natural channels into Lake Traverse, one of the boundary waters, to the detriment of the lands in South Dakota and North Dakota. The three States are now considering how these difficulties may be arranged by mutual agreements and improvements.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understand that what you want is for the Congress to consent that these States may make an agreement?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes. And I want to explain the urgency for this authority.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentleman has proceeded far enough.

Mr. STEENERSON. There is a great urgency. They want authority to agree upon plans for the improvement of these waters, so as to not only improve navigation thereon but facilitate drainage and prevent floods, and incidentally develop water power. I hope that the point of order will be withdrawn.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman has so completely convinced the House in the very few moments that we are ready to accept the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has so thoroughly convinced the committee of the necessity for it that I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STEENERSON. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice the amendment provides that the Secretary of War shall make survey to determine the amount to be contributed by the General Government, and the feasibility, and so forth. I think that ought not to read "determine." I do not think the Secretary of War can determine the amount the Federal Government may be called upon to contribute. It might be "to report upon." The word "determine" ought to be changed. That is in the second paragraph.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say to the gentleman that the expenses of this survey are to be borne by the local interests under the provision of the amendment.

Mr. MANN. That is not the point. The amendment reads:

The Secretary of War is authorized to make a survey of any project proposed by the governors of said States, or any two of them, to determine the feasibility thereof, and the expenses of carrying the same into effect, and what share of such expenses shall be borne by the different States, local interests, or by the National Government.

The Secretary of War can not "determine" the amount.

Mr. SMALL. What language would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. MANN. "Report upon."

Mr. SMALL. I suggest you accept that.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to have the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] heard.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] wants to be heard.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is satisfactory.

Mr. MANN. I move to amend the amendment by striking out, in the third line of the second paragraph, the word "determine" and insert in lieu thereof "report upon."

Mr. SMALL. I hope the amendment will be adopted, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment, in the third line of the second paragraph, by striking out the word "determine" and inserting the words "report upon."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois? Did he intend that the word "determine" was to be displaced where it is and the words "report upon" put in its place?

Mr. MANN. Strike out "determine" and insert "report upon."

Mr. SMALL. In substitution for "determine"?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on this item. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Controller Bay, Alaska.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment by Mr. BURGESS: Page 44, after line 4, insert: "Galveston Bay, at Smiths Point, Tex."

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., of Kansas, a corporation created under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Kansas, be, and it is hereby, granted authority to maintain its wharf, known as "long wharf," in the harbor of San Diego, Cal., where the same extends across certain submerged lands of the United States, ceded to the United States by act of the Legislature of the State of California, approved March 9, 1897, which said submerged lands lie in front of certain upland property of the United States described as lots 1 to 19 of block 18 of the city of San Diego, upon the following conditions and limitations: That the United States shall have free use of the so-called "west wharf" of the said railway company, adjoining and connected with the said "long wharf" in the harbor of San Diego, under such rules and regulations as may from time to time be agreed upon between the local representatives of the railway company, and the commanding officer of Fort Rosecrans, Cal.: *Provided*, That if, at any time, the said parties shall fail to agree as to said rules and regulations, the then existing status of the occupancy and use of said wharf shall not be disturbed until the controversy shall be referred to the general manager of the railway company and the department commander, Western Department, United States Army, for decision, and an agreement shall have been reached by them in the matter: *Provided further*, That the United States shall have the right to make such improvements to the said "west wharf" at its own expense as may be necessary to give the United States adequate and reasonable accommodations, provided such improvements shall be made without unnecessary interference with the operation of the railway company in its relations to the public as a common carrier and in its use of the said wharf as such common carrier: *And provided further*, That the railway company shall not be required to add to or alter the said "west wharf" or to add to or alter the warehouse and storeroom accommodations connected therewith. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the section just read. I would like to engage the attention of the chairman of the committee. I wish the chairman would direct my attention to the page in the report where this proposal is referred to. I have endeavored to locate it in this voluminous report of over 500 pages and have not been able to find any provision in reference to it whatever on any of the substantive provisions carried in the later sections of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does not seem to be in the report.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will ask the chairman further if there is anything contained in this voluminous report relating to these substantive items in these later sections of the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Probably not. I am not sure about that. But I hold in my hand here, Mr. Chairman, a letter from the Secretary of War regarding this matter and approving the provision in the bill. I will ask that it be read from the Clerk's desk.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think we ought to have some information as to the need of this, because nothing is stated in the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Clerk read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 23, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of the 26th ultimo, with which you forwarded to this department a copy of H. R. 14790, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, providing for "granting to the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. the right to maintain a wharf across certain submerged lands of the United States in the harbor of San Diego, Cal.," and requested to be furnished with the opinion of the War Department on the measure, I have the honor to inform you as follows:

The accompanying bill (H. R. 14790) proposes to grant, under certain conditions contained therein, permission to the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. to maintain its existing "Long Wharf" in San Diego Bay, a portion of which, in its present location, occupies certain land under water belonging to the United States and forming a part of the San Diego Barracks Reservation.

The matter of securing permission to continue the occupancy of this land was presented in a letter of the railway company dated October 7, 1915, and forwarded to this department by the district Engineer officer at Los Angeles on October 13, 1915. In pursuance of this, and in accordance with recommendations of the department commander, a license was granted by the War Department, subject to the action which might be taken by Congress.

The bill to which you refer is drafted substantially in accordance with the conditions heretofore approved by the War Department, but it is understood that the word "eight," in line 1, page 2, should be changed to "eighteen," and that the word "manner," in line 16 of the same page, should read "matter."

It does not appear that the interests of navigation will be materially affected by the enactment of the proposed legislation, and no objection to its enactment is apparent to this department.

Very respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will say that the provision in the bill is an exact copy, as I understand it, of the bill to which reference is made and which was introduced, I think, by Mr. KETTNER, of California, together with the amendments suggested in the letter of the Secretary of War.

Mr. STAFFORD. By this provision we are not merely confirming a license or permit that may be issued by the Secretary of War, but we are conferring upon the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. a permanent right to use the wharves in front of Government-owned lands and over other Government lands. I can not see any exigency that could require the insertion in this bill of an item of this importance, even though the Secretary of War says there is no objection to it. Unless the gentleman can advance some reason why there is a special exigency for it I shall press the point of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is, and I think that letter so states, that the railroad has been going over that land for quite a time under a license which will soon expire, and it is necessary if it is to be renewed that Congress should take this action.

Mr. STAFFORD. This paragraph does not delegate to the Secretary of War the authorization of a license. It is a permanent grant. I think the matter is altogether too important to be annexed as a rider to an appropriation bill, especially as the report gives no information, and none as to where Members can obtain knowledge as to its merits. Therefore, I feel justified in pressing the point of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the paragraph is subject to a point of order. The wharf is on navigable waters, and we are dealing with navigable waters and the facilities at times for reaching navigable waters. For instance, we have undoubted jurisdiction of terminal facilities under certain circumstances. We have the right to impose as a condition precedent to an improvement the leasing of terminals. Why have we not equal jurisdiction to make the requirement on a railroad company after an improvement is made that we have before the improvement is undertaken?

The CHAIRMAN. Is this a proposition to authorize the Santa Fe Railroad to establish a terminal on public land?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a provision authorizing the railroad to cross Government land to reach a wharf already in existence.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman pardon an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this proposed authorization is not only to cross Government-owned lands but those lands that are submerged and under water. It is now occupied by this same railway company, and this legislation is in response to a letter from the Secretary of War to the railway company, as is stated in the letter just read at the Clerk's desk, suggesting to them that they should get a conditional grant or authorization of the privilege respecting the use of the terminal. I submit it is not subject to a point of order.

It refers to lands owned by the Government, lands which are submerged, lands which are under the control of the War Department, lands which were acquired by the United States in connection with the improvements in the harbor at San Diego, and it is entirely within the jurisdiction of this committee. It is not only without injury to the United States but it is in pursuance of a recommendation made by the Secretary of War that the railway company obtain a conditional permission to occupy the property.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inquire does this provision add to the terminal facilities of the railroad company, or does it give them permission to use this water front?

Mr. SMALL. It grants permission to use certain lands under water as part of its terminal.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is in error. It simply authorizes the permanent use of the wharf by a railroad company.

Mr. SMALL. It is not a permanent occupation.

Mr. STAFFORD. It says so here.

Mr. SMALL. It is under certain conditions, under such rules and regulations as may be agreed upon.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. KETTNER] introduced this provision and is greatly interested in its adoption. San Diego is his home city and it has a great harbor. Unfortunately Mr. KETTNER is not in the Chamber at this moment, having been called to the Navy Department on an important mission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the jurisdiction of this committee is over rivers and harbors. This proposition is to grant the use of this wharf as a railroad terminal. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That Bayou Meto in the State of Arkansas be, and the same is hereby declared to be, a nonnavigable stream, within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States. The right of the Congress to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire what is the necessity of declaring Bayou Meto nonnavigable? If it is a minor matter, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address myself to the point of order. There is a precedent for this legislation in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am merely seeking to get information.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. The information is this, Mr. Chairman: The object of this legislation is to reclaim for farming purposes about 80,000 or 100,000 acres of very rich land.

Mr. STAFFORD. The title of which is in the State of Arkansas?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. No, sir; in individuals.

Mr. STAFFORD. The United States has no claim whatever on it?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. No, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the public-buildings bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the public-buildings bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That section 4 of the river and harbor act of August 18, 1894, be, and is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe such regulations for the use, administration, and navigation of the navigable waters of the United States as in his judgment the public necessity may require for the protection of life and property, or of operations of the United States in channel improvement, covering all matters not specifically delegated by law to some other executive department. Such regulations shall be posted, in conspicuous and appropriate places, for the information of the public; and every person and every corporation which shall violate such regulations shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, on conviction thereof in any district court of the United States within whose territorial jurisdiction such offense may have been committed, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$500, or by imprisonment (in the case of a natural person) not exceeding six months, in the discretion of the court."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this section also for the purpose of obtaining information as to the extent to which this changes existing law.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the section of which this is amendatory is section 11 of the river and harbor act of 1902, which reads as follows:

SEC. 11. That section 4 of the river and harbor act of August 18, 1894, be, and is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe such rules and regulations for the use, administration, and navigation of any or all canals and similar works of navigation that now are or that hereafter may be owned, operated, or maintained by the United States as in his judgment the public necessity may require; and he is also authorized to prescribe regulations to govern the speed and movement of vessels and other water craft in any public navigable channel which has been improved under authority of Congress whenever in his judgment such regulations are necessary to protect such improved channels from injury or to prevent interference with the operations of the United States in improving navigable waters or injury to any plant that may be employed in such operations. Such rules and regulations shall be posted in conspicuous and appropriate places for the information of the public; and every person and every corporation which shall violate such rules and regulations shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof in any district court of the United States within whose territorial jurisdiction such offense may have been committed shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$500 or by imprisonment (in the case of a natural person) not exceeding six months, in the discretion of the court."

The purpose of this is simply to enlarge the authority of the War Department to make regulations for its channels under improvement and for the movements of steamboats in such channels, either while under improvement or when improved. In other words, it has been found that while the Bureau of Commerce has large powers as to the control and operation of

the steamboats themselves, yet frequently they are not applicable to regulations which are necessary in order to maintain the safety of channels and the safety of the work while the channels are under improvement. This is simply for the purpose of enlarging that authority so that the War Department may have more control over its channels, either in process of improvement or after they are improved.

Mr. HULBERT. Will the gentleman yield for a very brief question?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. Is not the purpose and effect of this amendment to meet the conditions of congestion, especially with regard to the manner in which the work of improvement is now going on in New York Harbor?

Mr. SMALL. As a matter of fact, its necessity is more acute in the large harbors, particularly in New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is some pressing need for it at the present time to meet the exigency?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the War Department is pressing it, I do not wish to insist on the point of order. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That section 9 of the river and harbor act approved July 25, 1912, be, and is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. That in the execution and inspection of river and harbor works, engineer officers are authorized to hire and use such transportation as may be necessary for the most economical and advantageous prosecution of the work."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an explanation of its necessity?

Mr. MANN. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. SMALL. In connection with this paragraph I will have read from the Clerk's desk a memorandum from the War Department relating to the necessity for this provision.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Memorandum.]

TRANSPORTATION ON RIVER AND HARBOR WORKS.

The river and harbor act approved July 25, 1912, contains the following provision:

"SEC. 9. In their execution and inspection of river and harbor work at points beyond easy reach of ordinary regular transportation lines engineer officers are authorized to hire and use such transportation as they may consider desirable and advantageous to the progress of the work."

The usefulness of this provision has in a large measure been defeated by the action of the accounting officers of the Treasury, as shown in the following instances:

In the Kansas City district, in order to expedite the business of the Government in connection with the inspection and supervision of river and harbor works in the charge of Lieut. Col. Henry Deakyn, Corps of Engineers, and in connection with examinations and investigations which he was required to make by direction and authority of Congress, it became necessary to furnish transportation to Capt. Robert S. Thomas, Corps of Engineers, and certain civilian employees.

The journeys were made by automobile upon two occasions between two points on a railway paralleling the Missouri River above Kansas City, about 46 miles apart. To have used the railway would have involved a wait on each occasion of about 25 hours, until the next day, while each journey was made by automobile in the early evening in about 4 hours. Thus by the use of the automobile practically two entire days were saved to the Government, while the cost to the Government of one day's services, with railway travel allowances, of the persons who used the automobile would have amounted to more than was paid for the use of the automobile.

The account was disallowed by the auditor on the ground that—

"The laws relating to transportation contemplate that reimbursement or mileage shall be paid only where the travel incurred is over the shortest usually traveled route, by the mode usually adopted, and by conveyances usually employed. The places between which this expense was incurred are directly connected by railroad and the usual mode of travel is by train. The hire of an automobile is an extraordinary means of transportation, which does not appear to be authorized by section 9 of the river and harbor act of July 25, 1912, which only authorizes the hire of private conveyance at points beyond easy reach of ordinary regular transportation lines."

On appeal to the Comptroller of the Treasury the following decision was rendered by him:

"In their execution and inspection of river and harbor improvement work at points beyond easy reach of ordinary regular transportation lines engineer officers are authorized to hire and use such transportation as they may consider desirable and advantageous to the progress of the work."

"Under the language of this law it would appear to be the intention of Congress to leave the question of the class or kind of special transportation to be hired to the discretion of the administrative officers. The fact that an automobile was hired is immaterial. The question for my determination is whether two places connected by one train a day are 'beyond easy reach of ordinary regular transportation lines' within the meaning of the above act."

"The fact that a train is not ready when an engineer officer is does not create such a situation as this law contemplates. A direct line of railroad between two points, on which passenger trains are operated as often as business justifies, or as required by public authority, is an 'ordinary regular transportation line' within the meaning of the above

law, and the two points are not beyond but are within easy reach within the meaning of the law.

"Beyond easy reach," as used in this law, probably refers to such points as are outside of a reasonable walking distance from regular transportation lines, such as railways, steamboat lines, stage coaches, street cars, etc. It certainly does not refer to the time in which the places can be reached by regular transportation lines.

"The action of the auditor in this case is affirmed, and a certificate of no difference will issue."

Similar cases have arisen in the Wilmington, N. C. district. It became necessary for an assistant engineer to make inspections at widely separated points on several occasions. By the use of an automobile he was able to complete his inspections and return to his station in one day's time on each occasion. Had he not used the automobile two days' time would have been necessary for the work, necessitating additional expenditures for transfers, railway fares, lodgings, etc., for each occasion. These accounts have been disallowed by the auditor.

In order to obviate the objections of the accounting officers it is suggested that the legislation provided in section 9 of the river and harbor act approved July 25, 1912, quoted above, be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. That in the execution and inspection of river and harbor works, engineer officers are authorized to hire and use such transportation as may be necessary for the most economical and advantageous prosecution of the work."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will observe that the necessity for this amendment arose out of the construction of existing law by the accounting officers of the Government—

Mr. MANN. The reason for it, not the necessity.

Mr. SMALL. In the opinion of the War Department the amendment will be in the interest of expedition and economy in the administration of the duties of the engineer.

Mr. MANN. Doubtless it would be in the interest of expedition, just for illustration if an engineer officer from the War Department Building, going over to the Anacostia Flats, could hire an automobile to take him over in 10 minutes' less time, or maybe 15 minutes' less time, than it would take him to go in a street car for 5 cents, and it would soon become the custom for them to do it. When it becomes the custom, no particular officer can be criticized. The first illustration offered in the memorandum of the War Department was that a man would have been delayed a day to take the train. Now, when the train is going, it will go just as fast as the automobile. If he had nothing else to do, the delay made no difference. If he had other things to do and did not know enough to accommodate himself to the time when the trains ran, he was not a proper man to be in the Government service. We all have to do that. The gentleman's proposition is that any engineer officer, at any time he chooses, may hire either an automobile or a steam launch to go wherever he pleases at Government expense, without any check upon him at all except his sweet will. I do not think that power ought to be given to these officers.

Mr. SMALL. Does not the gentleman think he is indulging in a rather violent assumption?

Mr. MANN. No; I know enough about it to know that it is not a violent assumption. I have been with some of these gentlemen. I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina that they are not all Army officers. Most of the men who do the real work connected with river and harbor improvement are civilian employees, who would be very glad to ride in automobiles and steam launches all the time if they could.

Mr. SMALL. But this is under the supervision of the engineer officers. The language of the section says that—

Engineer officers are authorized—

Mr. MANN. They are authorized—
to hire and use such transportation—

Mr. SMALL. Such transportation—
as may be necessary for the most economical and advantageous prosecution of the work.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. So that unless it is both economical and advantageous, it would not be authorized. It seems to me it is in the interest of economy.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows very well that wherever the power exists to expend money for personal comfort people expend it, until soon it becomes a custom. I would not blame an engineer officer or his civilian subordinate who is also an engineer officer for riding in an automobile to and from his work if the Government paid the expense and there was no personal criticism upon him. There could not be any personal criticism if it was the custom. I do not see any occasion for letting the bars absolutely down.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for this amendment arises out of this condition, that in the construction of the present law if there is railroad connection between the points to which the engineer officer travels, he must use the railroad, no matter how poor the connection and no matter how much longer time may be required, when if he were permitted to use other means of travel he could perform his work in less time, save time to the Government, and save the expenses of sub-

sistence during his prolonged absence. Mr. Chairman, in this day when automobiles have come into such common use some of the most economical of men use the automobile instead of railroad transportation where the railroad schedules do not conserve the most economical performance of their duties. Why should not engineers of the Army be given some discretion, to be exercised, in the words of the statute, when "necessary for the most economical and advantageous prosecution of the work"?

Why should they not be allowed to exercise that discretion and to choose the best means of transportation? If the gentleman intends to press his point of order, I do not think this is subject to a point of order. The original law was brought in by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and passed. It involves a matter concerning the engineers of the Army in the discharge of their duty in the prosecution of river and harbor improvements, and comes under the jurisdiction of the committee. Certainly, if the subject matter comes under the jurisdiction of the committee, then its instrumentalities for carrying out the law which it recommends also come within its jurisdiction. Upon the merits of it, the committee thinks it ought to be adopted.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RAINEY). The Chair does not think it is subject to a point of order. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MANN. Then I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the section.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, we are constantly asked to restrict the activities of the Government in the employment of automobiles. Congress gets a spasm once in awhile on the subject of cutting off automobiles. I never have sympathized with that. I believe there are many cases where automobiles ought to be permitted. The existing law permits engineer officers to employ means of transportation at points beyond the easy reach of transportation lines. This amendment proposes to strike that out and leave no control of the subject whatever. The inevitable result will be that the officers in charge of river and harbor work—and it is not merely Army officers, because the larger share of the men are civilian employees—will have permission to employ automobiles or launches on the water, although it may be a place just as easy to reach in the ordinary transportation by street cars and other lines. Where that power exists it never has been known not to be exercised after a while, little after little.

We have to-day in the Army, under the Engineer Corps, a larger number of vessels than there are in the Navy. They have gotten the idea that they are entitled to own and ride in a Government launch everywhere they go, when many times they could as easily ride in a street car, when the improvements are near a city, as they are in most cases. I do not think it is wise to give the Army or any branch of the Government authority, not to spend fixed appropriations for the purpose, but authority to expend all or any part of the money appropriated for improvements. We maintain the offices of the engineers out of these appropriations, although the appropriations may be made and never a dollar of it used in river and harbor improvement; yet they take off a fixed percentage for the maintenance of the offices up here, and nobody knows anything about how much it costs. There is no estimate and no report. I am not in favor of giving to the Army engineers power to spend all they want, without any restriction whatever, for the purpose of pleasure or business rides, for that matter.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a brief reference to this. When this section which it is proposed to amend was adopted in the river and harbor act of 1912, it is my recollection, and I am sure the RECORD will disclose that the purpose of it was to permit the engineer officers, in the interest of expedition and economy in the discharge of their duties, to hire any method of transportation which, in their judgment, would be most economical and advantageous. It was never conceived when this committee had this under discussion that the accounting officer of the Government would hold that because there was a connecting line of railroad the engineers must use it, regardless of the time consumed by the railroad line, or regardless of the time consumed by the engineer in making his trips. The purpose in mind at that time did not materialize because of the construction of the act by the auditor and comptroller. Now, the only purpose of this is to make clear that which was intended to be done by the original provisions in the act of 1912.

I do not understand that the gentleman from Illinois denies the proposition that frequently it is advisable in the interest of economy to use an automobile even where there is a connecting line of railroad, and the only objection he urges is that it is not wise to vest the engineer officers with this discretion. While

his opinion is always entitled to deference, I respectfully disagree with him, and I believe that the engineer officers would use discretion in the interest of economy and advantage to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPARKMAN) there were—ayes 47, noes 31.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A parliamentary inquiry. If the call of the House shows that a quorum is present, will anyone have the opportunity to ask for tellers? I do not want to lose any rights.

Mr. MANN. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that pending a point of no quorum the gentleman can not make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that nothing is in order now but the ascertainment of a quorum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum and ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on ordering tellers. The question was taken, and tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN appointed as tellers the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 52 ayes and 32 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twelve Members present, a quorum.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment as a new section to section 7.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Insert, after line 11, page 49, the following as a new section:

"That an act entitled 'An act authorizing the condemnation of lands or easements needed in connection with works of river and harbor improvement at the expense of persons, companies, or corporations,' approved May 16, 1906, be amended so as to read as follows:

"That whenever any person, company, or corporation, municipal or private, or any State, or any reclamation, flood-control, or drainage district, or other public agency created by any State, shall undertake to secure any land or easement therein, needed in connection with a work of river and harbor improvement duly authorized by Congress, for the purpose of conveying the same to the United States free of cost, or for the purpose of constructing, maintaining, and operating locks, dry docks, or other works to be conveyed to the United States free of cost, and of constructing, maintaining, and operating dams for use in connection therewith, and shall be unable for any reason to obtain the same by purchase and acquire a valid title thereto, the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, cause proceedings to be instituted in the name of the United States for the acquisition by condemnation of said land or easement, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General of the United States to institute and conduct such proceedings upon the request of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That all expenses of said proceedings and any award that may be made thereunder shall be paid by such person, company, or corporation, or State, or reclamation, flood-control, or drainage district, or other public agency, as aforesaid, to secure which payment the Secretary of War may require such person, company, or corporation, or State, or reclamation, flood-control, or drainage district, or other public agency, as aforesaid, to execute a proper bond in such amount as he may deem necessary before said proceedings are commenced."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that with the explanation I shall make any apparent objection to this item will be removed. This amends the act approved May 16, 1906, in this respect: The original act had application to public improvements where there was local cooperation. The language of the original act of 1906 was:

Whenever any person, company, or corporation, municipal or private, shall undertake to secure—

And so forth.

An engineer officer has construed that as not permitting a State to cooperate, and in the State of California the State reclamation board is not permitted to cooperate. The same construction will arise as to local cooperation in other States. The purpose of this amendment is to enlarge the original act of 1906 in public improvements, where there is local cooperation, so as to permit States to cooperate or to permit any public agency created by the States to cooperate with the United States in any work of public improvement. The attention of the committee was called to this particularly by the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY], in whose district is situated, in part at least, the reclamation district of the San Juan and Sacramento Valleys, where there is large local cooperation by the

State of California. As I say, the engineer officer has so interpreted the act as to prevent the State from cooperating. The only purpose of this is to enlarge it, and with that explanation we hope that any objection will be removed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understand the only addition to the present law are the words "or any State, or any reclamation, flood control or drainage district, or other public agency created by any State"?

Mr. SMALL. The words added are:

Or any State, or any reclamation, flood control or drainage district, or other public agency created by any State.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very short amendment to the law which is now on the statute books and it is intended to permit a State to cooperate with the United States Government in river and harbor work, and to use the act of eminent domain. Under the present statute the words "or any State, or any reclamation, flood control or drainage district, or other public agency created by any State," are not present. The amendment adds those three propositions. This was brought about in this way. At the present time the State government and the Federal Government are in cooperation on work at the mouth of the Sacramento River, which is for the purpose of navigation. It is widening and deepening and straightening the mouth of the Sacramento. The district officer raised the point that the United States Attorney General under the present law could not bring condemnation proceedings in the name of the State as the word "State" does not appear in the law. It is to correct that defect which not only affects California but every other State in the Union where the Federal Government and the State are in cooperation. The State government pays for all of the proceedings.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURRY. Yes.

Mr. KENT. I would like to ask the gentleman if under existing conditions the total cost of the land taken is not imposed upon the State of California?

Mr. CURRY. It is all imposed upon the State of California. California pays for all of it and deeds it to the United States Government.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand that means this: That where the State and Federal Government are cooperating on the river and harbor improvements, it is necessary to resort to these proceedings of condemnation in order that the Attorney General may have the authority to invoke the proceedings, and it is now held that when they are cooperating he does not have the authority, so it is merely to extend it?

Mr. CURRY. That is all.

Mr. BUTLER. It does not seem to me that it is a very dangerous amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, since reading the amendment and hearing the explanation I think that this amendment ought to be adopted. I therefore withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That a commission is hereby created consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the chairman of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, and two other members of said committee to be appointed by the President of the Senate, not more than two of whom shall be of the same political party, also three members of the present Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the Sixty-fifth Congress, not more than two of whom shall be of the same political party, whose duty it shall be, and the same is authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as it may adopt, to investigate the feasibility and advisability of a more comprehensive system of river and harbor improvements in the interest of navigation, and in connection therewith the development and regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, the promotion of terminal and transfer facilities and sites, the drainage and reclamation of lands, the irrigation of arid lands, the protection against floods, the development and utilization of water power, the clarification of streams, and the regulation of the flow thereof, the prevention of soil erosion and waste, the storage and conservation of water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and domestic uses, and also the subject of cooperation between the United States and the several States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions of the States, including levee and drainage districts, corporations, and individuals, respectively. The heads of the several departments of the Government may, in their discretion, upon the request of the commission, through the Secretary of War, detail representatives from their respective departments to assist the commission in any feature of the several investigations herein authorized. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to provide the commission with such clerical or other assistants as may be deemed necessary. The said commission shall report to Congress on or before the 1st day of December, 1917, plans for the development of waterways and water resources of the United States for the uses and purposes above mentioned.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order until we can make some corrections in the text?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. An amendment can only be read for information.

Mr. SMALL. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments which I send to the desk be read for information pending the decision of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "Congress," in line 23, on page 50, insert the words "to be appointed by the Speaker of the present House."
In line 23, on page 51, after the word "Congress," strike out the words "on or before the first day of December, nineteen hundred and seventeen."

After the period at the end of line 26, page 51, insert the following:
"And in order to defray the expenses made necessary by the provisions of this section the sum of \$100,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, and to be paid out upon warrants drawn upon the Secretary of the Treasury by the chairman of said commission."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, Rule XI, making the Rivers and Harbors Committee a privileged committee, reads as follows:

The committees having jurisdiction of appropriations, the general appropriations bills; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, bills for the improvements of rivers and harbors.

There has been a great many rulings upon that provision, and they have all held that it must be more or less strictly construed. Now, I call the attention of the Chair to the language of this section. Commencing, page 51, at the top of the page:

of a more comprehensive system of river and harbor improvements in the interest of navigation, and in connection therewith the development and regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, the promotion of terminal and transfer facilities and sites, the drainage and reclamation of lands, the irrigation of arid lands, the protection against floods, the development and utilization of water power, the clarification of streams, and the regulation of the flow thereof, the prevention of soil erosion and waste, the storage and conservation of water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and domestic uses, and also the subject of cooperation between the United States and the several States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions of the States, including levee and drainage districts, corporations, and individuals, respectively.

Why, I submit to the Chair, that covers practically all the planet. As I read that through I could not help but think of a remark I heard one time made by a lawyer when he was arguing a proposition before the court he exclaimed, "If your honor please, this contract is unparalleled in the history of courts for being void" [laughter], and this provision is unparalleled in the history of this House for being subject to the point of order. I do not think it worth while to take up the time of the Chair any further than to call his attention to the provision of the section. I will call his attention to one decision in Hinds's Precedents, volume 4, section 4165, that is directly in point.

A provision relating to a commission to investigate the conditions and uses of water adjacent to an international boundary line was ruled out of the rivers and harbors bill as not being within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

I will read a portion of that section to the Chair:

That those members of the International Waterways Commission, created in accordance with section 4 of the rivers and harbors act of June 15, 1902, who represent the United States, shall have power, and it shall be their duty, to investigate and report upon the conditions and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary line between the United States and Canada, and the waters flowing from the United States into Canada or from Canada into the United States, and the tributaries of such waters; also upon the maintenance and regulation of suitable levels; and also upon the effect on the shores of those waters and structures thereon and upon the interests of navigation by reason of the diversion of these waters from or change in their natural flow.

Now, that provision is not nearly as broad as the provisions in this bill, yet that was held subject to the point of order. Certainly it can not be contended that the Rivers and Harbors Committee have jurisdiction over all these subjects that are enumerated in this section, and in my judgment it does not need further argument.

Mr. HULBERT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. Does the gentleman know whether it is the intent and purpose under this provision that the Members from the Senate and House would be appointed in order of seniority?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know anything about the purposes of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Washington that the Chair there held that the proposition was not in order because it referred to a boundary line commission

that gave power to the boundary line commission in reference to international watercourses, and the Chair held that a proposition to give power to a boundary line commission on an international watercourse is not within the jurisdiction of the committee. Mr. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois, made a point of order against the section.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It was also out of order on the proposition not only that it was beyond their jurisdiction, such is not a privileged matter. Creating a commission for this purpose is not a privileged proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The authorities are divided upon the gentleman's position.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard when the gentleman concludes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I also desire to call the attention of the Chair to section 4219, where it says:

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors does not have jurisdiction of the subject of canals, and may not include provisions therefor in the rivers and harbors appropriation bill.

That has been decided a good many times. Here we not only take jurisdiction over, or attempt to take jurisdiction over rivers and harbors, but over flood control, over irrigation, and over practically everything else.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, just a word about the decision cited a moment ago. I understood the Chair to say to the gentleman from Washington the point of order was not to an item offered to a privileged bill which did not come within the privileges granted to the committee. Certainly that was the point of order which I made. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, under the rules of the House, are granted jurisdiction over improvements of rivers and harbors, and they would acquire jurisdiction over any public bill referred to them and might report it to the House and no one could make a point of order that it was not an improvement to a river or harbor, but there is a difference entirely between the jurisdiction of a committee over a bill and the jurisdiction of a committee to report a bill as a privileged matter. This bill comes before the House as a privileged matter. It was reported as a privileged matter by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] from the floor of the House. He moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union as a privileged motion.

The bill is before the House as a privileged bill. Now, the privilege only extends to the improvement of rivers and harbors. Any item in the bill or any amendment offered to the bill which does not come within the privilege of the committee is subject to a point of order. That was the point of order which I made on the International Boundary Commission. There might have been a bill introduced on that subject, and it might have been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and they might have reported it, but when they call it up as a privileged bill they must confine their operations to the subject of improvement of rivers and harbors.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, just a word in amplification of the argument made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The Chair will notice that this bill was not introduced in the ordinary way in the House and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and then reported in the usual way to the House, but it was reported on January 13 from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors as an original bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserved all points of order. Now, the only question for the Chair to consider is to determine whether this provision under consideration is privileged within the meaning of section 56 of Rule XI. The only jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to report a privileged bill is to report a bill that is restricted to matters pertaining to river and harbor improvements. It is not a general appropriation bill, and the authority for the holding of the Speaker in times past that the river and harbor appropriation bill is a privileged bill is in those lines found in clause 56, Rule XI, which read as follows:

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors may at any time in a general omnibus bill or in any single bill bring into the House as privileged matters pertaining to the improvement of rivers and harbors. They may have jurisdiction over the general subject of matters pertaining to the improvement of rivers and harbors, but there is that nice distinction running through all the precedents that in order for the river and harbor bill to be privileged it must contain only those matters that relate to the improvement of rivers and harbors.

Therefore, is the section under consideration one that the Rivers and Harbors Committee, if it reported it, even though it

had jurisdiction, could introduce as a privileged bill? The Chair can not under the broadest scope of construction of parliamentary law hold that. If the River and Harbor Committee had presented this section 9 as an original proposition and the chairman had come into the House and said, "Mr. Speaker, I introduce a privileged bill from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors," and the gentleman from Illinois or somebody else would make the point of order, the Speaker would necessarily have held that, while perhaps the Committee on Rivers and Harbors might have had jurisdiction of that proposition if the bill had originally been introduced in its usual way, and no objection had been made to the reference of the bill as provided under the rule for a committee claiming jurisdiction on a motion by the committee for reference to call the attention of it to the House, there is no question whatsoever that any chairman would hold that that bill was privileged.

The Chair can not disassociate in consideration of this fact that this section 9 must be considered as a separate bill presented for the first time in the House as a privileged bill. Is it privileged under the rules of the House? Why, it does not pertain to the improvement of rivers and harbors. And there has been no construction in all the precedents that will justify it.

The Chair must also separate the river and harbor bill from all the appropriation bills, and the reason why this distinction has been made is that the river and harbor bill is not considered a general appropriation bill. It can embody any legislation, but the legislation must be that which relates to the improvement of rivers and harbors. This does not. This relates primarily to the establishment of a commission, and I ask the attention of the Chair to the fact that he is in error in holding that the ruling of the Hon. Frank Currier—and the chairman now presiding over the committee remembers the superior qualities of Mr. Currier as a parliamentarian—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not as yet made a ruling.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should have said the suggestion of the Chair. The ruling of Mr. Currier was that an amendment providing for the establishment of a commission was not in order because it was not privileged. That amendment was:

SEC. 6. That those members of the International Waterways Commission, created in accordance with section 4 of the river and harbor act of June 13, 1902, who represent the United States shall have power, and it shall be their duty, to investigate and report upon the conditions and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary lines between the United States and Canada, and of waters flowing from the United States into Canada or from Canada into the United States, and of the tributaries of such waters; also upon the maintenance and regulation of suitable levels; and also upon the effect upon the shores of these waters and the structures thereon and upon the interests of navigation by reason of the diversion of these waters from or change in their natural flow; and, further, to report upon the necessary measures to regulate such diversion, and to make such recommendations for improvement and regulations as shall best subserve the interests of the two Governments in said waters.

That provision was one exclusively for the appointment of a commission to investigate certain matters over which the commission had authority to investigate. There may be in this section some authority which would warrant the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, if it had been introduced in the basket in the usual way, and being referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and then reported back in the usual way, but not as a privileged bill, to hold jurisdiction when it came up for consideration. But, Mr. Chairman, when you differentiate between the fact that this is not a general appropriation bill but a bill that receives its privilege based upon the precedents and those upon clause 56 of Rule XI, which states that only those matters that relate to the improvement of rivers and harbors are privileged, the Chair, I respectfully contend, must sustain the point of order of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this provision, in my opinion, is not subject to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] which, as I understand the point, is that the provision, while containing matter over which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors does have jurisdiction, includes other matter over which that committee does not entertain jurisdiction. But my position is that, containing matters as it does within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and that committee having reported the bill to this House, which now has the whole matter before it, this body can go ahead and consider the whole provision although it embodies other matters which, separately, would not come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and would not be properly in a measure like this.

The Committee on Rivers has, in a sense, broader powers than any other committee of the House, and a river and harbor

bill has a legislative status not possessed by an ordinary appropriation bill, and is not subject to the same legislative restrictions. It has been held, for instance, that the river and harbor bill, not being one of the general appropriation bills, the rule relating to legislation on such bills does not apply, and that rule has been followed by the House and presiding officials ever since it was first enunciated.

Now, with reference to the contention that the bill contains matters over which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors does not have jurisdiction, I wish to cite the Chair to a decision which, it seems to me, controls the matter, as it is on all fours, as I view it, with the point raised and with the discussion here. I refer to Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, page 857, section 4372, in which the Chair, among other things, said:

A bill may not be divided among two or more committees, although it may contain matters properly within the jurisdiction of several committees.

The statement of the point raised is as follows:

On March 8, 1890, the House was in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, considering the bill (H. R. 7156) to provide for the increase of the limit of cost of site and public building at Newark, N. J. The bill, after authorizing the purchase of land and construction of the building at an increased limit of cost, provided:

"And that the sum of \$300,000, in addition to the sum of \$350,000 appropriated by act of Congress approved March 1, 1888, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any moneys in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. William S. Holman, of Indiana, made a point of order that the bill made an appropriation of money.

It will be observed that the point raised by Mr. Holman was that the bill made an appropriation of money, which was beyond the jurisdiction of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, which could only authorize the construction of buildings without making appropriations therefor. After discussing the matter at some length the Chair continued as follows:

It must be remembered that the fact is, as the Chair thinks, that the reference of this bill on the 18th day of December last was the act of the House of Representatives, and was not the individual act of the Speaker, nor the act of the Speaker in his position as Speaker alone. The bill, in legal contemplation, was read a first and second time, and then referred, as was assumed, under the rule. The question has been presented in the arguments whether or not that was the proper reference. Now, it is conceded by gentlemen who are in favor of sustaining the point of order that the subject matter of the bill, which is the erection of a public building, was properly referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and could have been properly referred to no other committee.

It is suggested in argument that as the bill embraced two propositions, one of which might properly go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the other involving an appropriation, which, as suggested by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Breckenridge], ought properly to go to the Committee on Appropriations—in this view it has been suggested that some action should be had by which that kind of division should be made. But it has been repeatedly held that a bill can not be so divided. The Chair reads from the Manual and Digest:

"It has been uniformly held that a bill can not be divided among two or more committees, although it contains subject matter which legitimately belongs under Rule XI (the rule under consideration) to several committees; but must be referred to one committee as an entirety."

Because this bill was referred by the House to this committee—and not improperly, as the Chair thinks, for the reasons which have been stated—and because it is under consideration in Committee of the Whole, the Chair thinks this point of order must be overruled.

So it will be seen that although the bill to which reference is made had matter not cognizable before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, it was nevertheless held that a bill could not be divided among two or more committees, and that the public-buildings bill, in which the item was incorporated, had jurisdiction of it notwithstanding its multifarious nature. That would seem to settle the point of order in favor of the retention of the provision under discussion.

I therefore insist that the provision is properly in the pending bill, and should be retained there.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the provision is a very important one. Indeed, there is none more important in the measure. The time, in my opinion, has arrived when most, if not all, the things which are the subject matter of investigation under that provision should be undertaken in connection with the development of our rivers and harbors for navigation purposes. Besides, I think the passage of the bill with this provision in it would go far toward silencing at least a part of the criticism that has been made against river and harbor legislation during the past few years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] fails to make a distinction between a privileged bill coming from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and a general bill which has been introduced through the basket in the ordinary course.

As I said in my argument, if the gentleman from Florida had introduced section 9 through the basket in the ordinary way and it had been reported to the committee in the ordinary way and reported to the House in the ordinary way and referred

to the Committee of the Whole House, then it would be too late for any person to make a point of order because it contained other matters which were within the scope of the jurisdiction of other committees. But if the gentleman from Florida had introduced section 9 in the House originally, as this bill was introduced originally, it never having been heretofore introduced as a bill in the regular course, then a point of order would have been raised to it because it contained matters which were not privileged. There can be no question about that.

The citation read by the gentleman from Florida has no application whatsoever to this case, because it fails to make the distinction between a bill referred to the committee in the ordinary course and a bill introduced into the House as a matter of privilege.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the views presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] are rather subtle and technical. I claim no particular knowledge concerning parliamentary law, but I do wish to submit one thought in connection with this point of order. This section provides for the appointment of a commission. For what purpose? To investigate the feasibility and advisability of a more comprehensive system of river and harbor improvements in the interest of navigation.

Now, it may be assumed that the gentleman from Wisconsin would not claim that so far it would be subject to a point of order. Therefore, if it is subject to a point of order at all, it is as to the remainder of the section.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman contend, if the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had, without the bill having been introduced in the regular way and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, risen at any time in his seat in the House and had said, "Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged bill reported from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors," the bill embodied in section 9, that because it contained one item referring to matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that would warrant this House in considering it as a privileged bill?

That is an outrageous proposal. Under that construction, Mr. Chairman, they could take under consideration the entire scope of legislation, because one little item included in the bill would relate to rivers and harbors.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that per contra; simply because there was one item in the bill which did not appear to be within the jurisdiction of the committee, therefore the whole section would not be vitiated.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be brief, and here is the point I want to submit: Here is a section which creates a commission for the purpose of investigating the feasibility and advisability of a more comprehensive system of river and harbor improvements in the interest of navigation; that the committee has jurisdiction of the provision to that extent; and that its jurisdiction is not divested because of the remainder of the section.

Now, the remainder is what? It says, "In connection with an investigation of rivers and harbors in the interest of navigation, to consider the development and the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, the promotion of terminal and transfer facilities, and sites, drainage, and reclamation, irrigation, protection against floods, water power," and so forth.

No, Mr. Chairman; if the proposition can be maintained that this section creating a commission to investigate rivers and harbors, a better system for their improvement in the sole interest of navigation, is made subject to a point of order, and the jurisdiction of the committee divested by reason of the inclusion of these other items, that it would do violence to the rules and impair the usefulness of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Under section 56 of Rule XI jurisdiction of this committee is limited to bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

All points of order were reserved on this bill, and the point of order is now made to section 9 of the bill. Section 9 provides for the appointment of a commission to investigate and report on a more comprehensive system of river and harbor improvements in the interest of navigation. This is, of course, clearly within the province of this committee to report. The section under consideration however, continues and provides that the commission in connection with this investigation may report upon matters pertaining to—

The promotion of terminal and transfer facilities and sites, the drainage and reclamation of lands, the irrigation of arid lands, the protection against floods, the development and utilization of water power, the clarification of streams, and the regulation of the flow thereof, the prevention of soil erosion and waste, the storage and conservation of water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and domestic uses, and also the subject of cooperation between the United States and the sev-

eral States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions of the States, including levee and drainage districts, corporations, and individuals, respectively.

The question does not arise here as to the committee to which a bill conferring all these powers upon a commission should be referred. This bill did not go through the basket. This provision is being presented now for the first time. If the bill had gone through the basket in the ordinary way, and had been referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and if the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had considered the matter and reported it back, the Chair does not think the point of order would lie at all. In that case the House would have had the opportunity presented to it to change the reference of this bill and to refer it to any other committee that the House might select for its consideration.

The Chair does not think the decision to which the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] calls attention is applicable to the present case. The bill there referred to went through the basket and to the committee. The question arose as to whether the bill had been properly referred to the Committee, and in passing upon the question the Chairman ruled in the following language, discussing the committee to which this bill should have gone:

Clearly it could not go to the Committee on Appropriations, because in general appropriation bills nothing is allowable except appropriations for expenses incurred in pursuance of existing law. As the bill had to go somewhere; as it did go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; as that committee has reported the bill, and it has been committed by the House to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and is now under consideration in Committee of the Whole, the Chair is of opinion that it is properly cognizable here and that the point of order should be overruled.

In connection with this question the Chair desires to say that a matter of the correction of a reference or taking any advantage of any improper reference is purely a matter for the House itself. Under the existing rules, if this bill had been referred by the Speaker without the knowledge of the House—furtively, as suggested—perhaps by the influence of some Member who desired the bill to go to a committee that had not jurisdiction—if a bill under those circumstances should be referred to a committee not having jurisdiction, it would be because the rules gave the Speaker that power. But the rules also provide that any improper reference of a bill may be corrected in any one of three ways—

And then the ruling indicates the ways in which improper references may be corrected.

It is insisted also by members of the committee that the bill contains a provision within the jurisdiction of the committee and within its privilege to report, conferring upon this proposed commission the power to report on more comprehensive system of river and harbor improvements in the interest of navigation; and it is insisted that because in connection with navigation and with such a report these other reports are required, therefore the entire section is in order.

The Chair desires to suggest that in connection with a report as to the interests of navigation on our rivers, this proposed commission might well consider the possibility of navigating our rivers with battleships drawing 21 feet of water; and because in connection with any report they might make they would have the right to consider the navigation of a river by battleships drawing that depth, therefore in connection therewith the committee might authorize the commission to report on the building of battleships, and what kind of battleships ought to be built. The same method of reasoning we are considering, it seems to the Chair, might just as logically lead to the conclusion just indicated.

The Chair thinks the point of order should be sustained to the section, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 35.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to offer an amendment to the last section.

Mr. HULBERT. I also want to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will not lose any rights by yielding to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to recur to page 35, line 19, for the purpose of offering an amendment to that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee asks unanimous consent to recur to page 35 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, let the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 35, line 19, after the word "maintenance," in line 19, insert "including, above Sacramento, the Red Bluffs."

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter that was passed over yesterday at the time it was read to be returned to later. That was, on page 11, Norfolk Harbor. I wish to offer an amendment to that, and after it is read I will explain it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 19, after the word "session," strike out the figures "\$270,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$360,000."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, as will be observed, this amendment increases the amount of the appropriation \$90,000. That appears to become necessary for this reason: When we adopted this project we thought there was a much larger sum on hand left over from a former appropriation than the amount actually there. It will be observed that the paragraph embraces this provision:

The unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made for improvement of channel to Norfolk, Va., is hereby made available for continuing improvement of said channel in accordance with the report submitted in said document.

It was the impression of the committee at the time it inserted the provision that there was on hand for work the sum of \$130,000, but under a provision contained in the bill of 1915, \$90,000 of this sum was transferred and expended upon some other project. That we did not know, and believing that the larger sum was on hand, we fixed the amount at \$270,000 instead of \$360,000, as we would have done if we had known the exact condition with reference to the available funds. Hence I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the last section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 45, the paragraph at the top of the page, which was stricken out on a point of order, for the purpose of offering an amendment in a changed form.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to return to page 45 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, let the amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the top of page 45 the following:

"The Secretary of War is authorized to make such preliminary examinations as can be made from available data without making field surveys, touching the creation of conditions in or paralleling the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario to the Canadian border suitable in all respects for navigation by ocean-going ships, including such approximate estimate of cost of improvement as can be predicated on such available data, and an approximation of the amount of power, if any, that would be incident thereto."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new section, page 50.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, line 13, after the word "purpose," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"SEC. 9. That the following amendment to section 7, Article I, of the Constitution is hereby proposed and submitted to the several States, as follows."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not finished reading the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Enough has been read to show that the amendment is a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I make the point of order so as to prevent showing what it is.

Mr. HULBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. No; I think it is highly improper to bring such a matter into the House in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that it is clearly out of order, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. On page 18 there is appropriated \$330,000 for maintenance of the St. Johns River from Jacksonville to the ocean. The engineer's report shows that this is not only for maintenance but for improvement of the jetties. What I want to ask the gentleman is whether this appropriation provided in the bill covers the extension and repairs of the jetties?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say that that was called to my attention the other day; and, having investigated the matter by reading the report, I see that it is for the repair of the jetties and maintenance. Of course, that would be covered by the language of the bill.

Mr. SEARS. I wanted to ask the question because I had this up with the gentleman at the time of the investigation, and I wanted it stated in the Record.

Mr. DUPRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new section.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That a commission is hereby created, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the chairman of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, and two other members of said committee to be appointed by the President of the Senate, not more than two of whom shall be of the same political party, also three members of the present Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the Sixty-fifth Congress, not more than two of whom shall be of the same political party, whose duty it shall be, and the same is authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as it may adopt, to investigate the feasibility and advisability of a more comprehensive system of river and harbor improvements in the interest of navigation, and all uses of water relating thereto, and also the subject of cooperation between the United States and the several States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions of the States, including levee and drainage districts, corporations, and individuals, respectively. The heads of the several departments of the Government may, in their discretion, upon the request of the commission, through the Secretary of War, detail representatives from their respective departments to assist the commission in any feature of the several investigations herein authorized. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to provide the commission with such clerical or other assistants as may be deemed necessary. The said commission shall report to Congress on or before the 1st day of December, 1917, plans for the development of waterways and water resources of the United States for the uses and purposes above mentioned.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that portion of the amendment which relates to levees and drainage districts that it is not in order; also to that part authorizing the Secretary of War to provide clerks and other assistants as he may deem necessary. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors does not have jurisdiction to provide clerical assistance in the War Department. That is a matter within the control of the Committee on Appropriations, of which the distinguished gentleman from Kansas City is a member, and ought to be endeavoring to protect the rights of his committee. He knows that this committee has not jurisdiction over clerical assistance for anybody. There are several other things in the amendment that are subject to a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a further point of order that it is not privileged, because the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have not made the report, but it has been made by an individual Member. Under clause 56, Rule XI, it is only the committee that is authorized to make the report to make it privileged.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same amendment that was considered by the Chair a few minutes ago, the substantial change being in eliminating the enumeration of the purposes for which the commission shall be created and confining it to the investigation, feasibility, and advisability of a comprehensive river and harbor improvement in the interest of navigation and the uses of water related thereto. There is no question but that the main purpose is entirely within the jurisdiction of this committee, and germane and relevant to this bill. All of the other matters contained in the amendment are simply a part of the machinery. They are simply an incident to the creation of that commission.

As to the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois, that the cooperation of the United States and States in levee

and drainage districts renders it subject to a point of order, it is untenable. There is hardly a proposition in the bill that does not involve in some degree cooperation with local authorities and with drainage and levee districts.

If the Federal Government has the right to do a thing alone, it has the right under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court to do it either singly or jointly with other agencies, and the very fact that we have the right to improve a river for navigation gives us the right to cooperate with municipalities, drainage and levee districts for the same purpose. All of that language must be read in connection with the main purpose, which is the improvement of rivers and harbors for the purpose of navigation, and the incidents which follow there are clearly within the power of the committee and not subject to the point of order. I think, if I am not mistaken, I have heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] make that argument.

The other point of order is that the Secretary of War is not authorized to provide the commission with clerical or other assistance. The fact of the matter is that the improvement of rivers and harbors under our system is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War. It is a part of the duty of the Army engineers, and at the head of that is the Chief of Engineers. All of the clerical assistance now engaged, directly or indirectly, in this kind of work is at the instance of the Secretary of War. This does not provide any additional clerical assistance in any way, at least upon its face. It simply provides that the clerical assistance in the War Department shall be available for this particular purpose as it is available for the other portions of the same bill, and so the point of order must be overruled.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's position would present a very dangerous precedent in legislative procedure in the House. The chairman must consider this bill now as if section 9 had never been a part of the bill and some Member on his own initiative had risen and presented the amendment, as does the gentleman from Missouri, to the attention of the committee. As I attempted to point out in my argument on the question whether section 9 was in order, I wish to again direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that only the committee, not any individual Member, has the right to make a report covering matters relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors. This item must now be considered just as if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] rose in his place on the floor and presented the matter as a privileged bill.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not taken any action on the proposal offered by the gentleman from Missouri. That is out of the bill entirely. The Chair must consider this now as an original proposition. Can the Chair hold that any individual Member may rise upon the floor of the House at any time and present the proposal offered by the gentleman from Missouri and claim that it is privileged? The rules of the House have safeguarded the interests of legislation by providing that in order to have matters privileged, even though they relate to rivers and harbors, they must first be reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. That distinction is carried also in the Holman rule. Certain Members may have the privilege of offering certain amendments where they reduce appropriations, but in matters of substantive legislation they must first be reported and considered by the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter. It would be a very dangerous precedent indeed to permit any individual Member to be recognized and hold that this was a privileged matter which the individual Member, without the report of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, could present at any time. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not taken jurisdiction. Clause 56 of Rule XI reads:

The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, viz: * * * the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

It is that clause that gives the committee the right to make its matter privileged, not the individual Member. Therefore, following the ruling of the Chair as to section 9, this, too, must be ruled out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman that this committee has assumed jurisdiction and the House has acquiesced in that jurisdiction over drainage districts and levees on the Mississippi River, as well as on other rivers, and under authority conferred by other river and harbor bills, there is cooperation at the present time between individuals and corporations, municipalities and levee districts in the matter of drainage and reclamation of lands along rivers. That part of it might be in order. What the Chair is in doubt

about is the authority of this committee to command the services of clerks in the departments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as to that there can be no question as to the right of the Committee on Appropriations, under the authority granted to that committee, to provide for such clerical assistance. Clause 3 of Rule XI provides:

To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government as herein provided, viz, for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for the District of Columbia; for pensions; and for all deficiencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

That shows that the matter, if it was a distinct bill relating to that proposal, would have to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, because the Committee on Appropriations, as carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, has full authority to provide appropriations for the clerical work of the Government.

I wish again to call the attention of the Chair to this phase of the matter, which was fundamental in the consideration of the other section, that in order for any matter reported from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to be privileged it must relate to the improvement of rivers and harbors. It is true this relates to the improvement of rivers and harbors, but the House has never had the opportunity, because it embraces matters that pertain to other committees, for that committee or for some member of the other committee to test the judgment of the House as to whether the committee to which the bill has been referred is the committee which rightfully is entitled to its consideration. An individual Member here has no right to rise in his place and present as privileged something over which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction. The rule provides what the committee shall report. If the committee had made the report as embodied in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, why that shows that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has given it consideration. The gentleman from Missouri can not contend that the committee has made this report. It is the gentleman from Missouri himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear from the gentleman from Missouri on the question whether or not this committee has jurisdiction to authorize the commission to command the services of clerks in the War Department.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, my view of that subject is simply this: This bill commands the services of the War Department. All of this work that is authorized in this bill is imposed on the War Department. It is done through a department of the War Department, the Chief of Engineers. Every item in here that requires anything done is a direction to the War Department. The last section of the bill preceding this, or one section preceding this, relates to certain surveys. Each one of those surveys is a direction to the War Department. Whether the direction to the War Department be that certain surveys shall be made or that certain classes of work shall be done, it is on the same footing, is on all fours as far as the bill is concerned. One relates to clerical services and the other relates to engineering services. But there is absolutely no difference on the question of jurisdiction. As to the question of policy there might be a good deal of difference, but when it comes to the jurisdiction of the committee there is absolutely no difference between requiring the engineering services of the War Department and the clerical services of that department.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman is in error. Clerical services for the War Department are specifically appropriated for as services in the War Department. Under the proposed provision this independent commission could require the Secretary of War to detail to them employees specifically appropriated for for certain duties in the Department of War. The services of those employees and the authority to make provision for them is in the Committee on Appropriations. Such an amendment is not germane to the bill. The rivers and harbors bill is a privileged bill and is subject to the limitations that amendments to be in order must be germane to the bill, must be amendments the subject matter over which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors would have jurisdiction. It has no jurisdiction over the clerical services for which provision has been made in the legislative bill for the War Department. The amendment of the gentleman is based on the assumption that the War Department would control and dictate how those services shall be utilized by some independent commission in no way connected with the department except the incidental fact that the Secretary of War is a member of the commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the clerks in the War Department are being paid for the services they render there under the direction of the Secretary of War, and, while

the War Department has jurisdiction over rivers and this committee has the right at any time—perhaps this commission would also have the right, if conferred upon it by the committee—to call on the War Department for information, yet the Chair does not think that this committee has jurisdiction to report a bill giving to any commission the right to command the services of clerks from the War Department, take them out of the control of the Secretary of War, and subject them to their own control. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment as a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill insert as a new section the following: "The Secretary of War is hereby directed to report without delay to this House the survey provided for in the river and harbor act of 1913 relative to the encroachments and obstructions in the Chicago River and all its branches, together with such encroachments as have been made in and along the lake front between Lincoln Park and the Indiana State line."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, in the act of 1913 it was provided that the Board of Engineers of the War Department should make a survey of the Chicago River and all encroachments, as well as of the encroachments made upon the lake front between Lincoln Park and the Indiana State line. Now, that was in 1913. Up to this time, Mr. Chairman, we have been waiting for a report. I feel certain that that survey could have been completed within a few months. It is nearly four years, and the report has not been made as yet. The House is entitled to that report from the Board of Engineers or from the Secretary of War, and for that reason I have offered this amendment, hoping and trusting that the report will be forthcoming, as I can not see any reason why the report was not made to or three years ago. If there are any reasons why this report has not been made, if there are any people who are interested in seeing that this report is not made, the House is entitled to that information. For that reason I hope and trust that the amendment will prevail, feeling also that neither the chairman of the committee nor any member of the committee will have any objection to it.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to compel the Secretary of War to make a report forthwith upon a survey and examination ordered in the river and harbor act of 1913. Assuming that the report has not been made, because the gentleman seems to be well informed in that respect, it is equally fair to assume that some good reason exists why the report has not yet been made and not yet been submitted by the Secretary of War. Personally I have no knowledge of the subject and the chairman has not, and if any member of the committee has any familiarity with it he can speak for himself; but it is apparent that in a rivers and harbors bill we do not in mandatory terms direct the Secretary of War to make a report upon any examination heretofore authorized.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. In just a moment. There would be no end to these matters if we were to do that. Besides, if we take this course, it is simply a repetition, because in the original provision the Secretary of War was directed to make the examination, and it directed him to report; and presumably he will comply with that direction as soon as he can do so consistently in the performance of his duty. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any knowledge as to the number of reports not yet filed by the Secretary of War that have been authorized by Congress?

Mr. SMALL. There are quite a number, but I can not speak accurately.

Mr. TREADWAY. Would it not be just as proper that we should legislate on every one of them as on this particular one as to compelling a report? How is it within our jurisdiction to know when the circumstances of the survey have been sufficiently examined so that the department is prepared to report?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is entirely right. It would be just as appropriate to do so.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. SABATH. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe four years is time enough for the department to make a report ordered by this House?

Mr. SMALL. In answer to that, Mr. Chairman, it would appear prima facie that sufficient time had elapsed to enable the department to report; but in the absence of any knowledge as to the reason for the War Department in delaying their report, I do not think this House ought to adopt this amendment as a part of the bill.

Mr. SABATH. What would the gentleman say if I would inform him of the fact that I have made repeated requests on the department for this report, and it has been promised month in and month out during the last two years?

Mr. SMALL. If the gentleman will pardon me, that may be all true, that he has made repeated requests, and at the same time it may be entirely true that the department has good reasons for delaying their report.

Mr. SABATH. Then, I would like to know the reasons why they do not report. I would like to know who is interested and who is holding the report back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] says if there is any member of the committee that knew about this, to let him say so. I want to say to this House that I know considerable about it. The river and harbor bill in 1913, passed by this House, provided for an investigation of encroachments in the waters in and about Chicago, and anyone who has any knowledge of the geography of Chicago knows that there have been encroachments in all of the waters in and about Chicago. And the Members from Chicago tried to get a report upon them, and for four years this matter has been before the engineers and has been a joke in the engineers' office in Chicago. And men connected with the engineers' office in Chicago treated it as a joke; and there must be some influence at work to prevent the engineers from reporting to this House those encroachments in the waters in and about Chicago. I know now that they endeavored to substitute a report that was made to the Illinois Legislature by a committee, the chairman of which committee is now a Member of this House, Mr. CHITFIELD. His committee made an investigation of these encroachments, but we wanted this investigation made by this Government, because the property that has been encroached upon belongs to the people of this country.

Now, what was the result? From the information I have, this report is in the office of the Chief of Engineers now and has been there for seven or eight months, and if you inquire for this report by telephone to that office they will tell you that they do not know where it is. But the district engineer's office at Chicago has made a report, and yet we can not get the information contained in it.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNET. Is the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] satisfactory to the gentleman now speaking?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. The amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] simply provides that the engineer's office or the Secretary of War give that information to Congress. I think we are entitled to it. I think the amendment ought to be passed. It can not hurt anybody to know what persons, firms, or corporations are encroaching upon the public waters in and about Chicago.

Mr. BUTLER. Is the gentleman satisfied this material is in the office of the Secretary of War?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes; I am quite satisfied that the report is here in the War Department, and I hope the amendment offered by my colleague will pass. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for four minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for four minutes out of order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, at the close of this session the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will leave Congress. We all hope that his absence is only temporary. [Applause.] But as one who has been intimately associated with him for many years, I desire to take up a few minutes to pay to him a few words of deserved praise.

He has by his industry, ability, and faithfulness won a high place in the confidence and regard of this House. He would not have won it did he not deserve it. This is the most cold-blooded and calculating body in the world. Previous reputation or popular fame has little weight or influence in this House. This House mercilessly measures the merit of each Member by what he does here. A man that achieves a place here can achieve a place among men anywhere on this earth. [Applause.] No demagogue can long mislead this House. No

faker can long deceive it. They may fool the public, but not the House of Representatives.

The value of the training received in Congress in fitting a man for public service can not be overestimated. If the All-Wise in his inscrutable wisdom should ever again think it necessary to chasten this Nation by the election of a Democratic President, then I know that I express the wish of millions of the American people when I say I hope that that President may be CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri. [Applause.]

If the Republicans of the country knew him as we know him, they would nominate for President the most valuable legislator and most remarkable intellect that ever sat in the Halls of the American Congress—JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois. [Applause.] These two splendid Americans typify all that is highest and best in the Nation's life. By ability and training they are especially fitted for high public position.

How many grievous errors in the past would have been avoided and how many in the future will be avoided if the people could have but realized what this training here in Congress means. This experience here teaches a man so that he can never disregard it; the duties of each coordinate branch of the Government teaches him the respect due for each branch, and especially teaches him the vital danger to our institutions of one department encroaching upon the other.

After all has been said and done, gentlemen, in patriotism and ability this is the greatest body of men in the world.

One of the demonstrations of its greatness is the fact that while this aisle divides the parties it does not divide patriotism, ability, or friendships. [Applause.]

When the gentleman from Florida leaves this body he will take with him the regard, the confidence, and good wishes of every Member of the House. [Applause.] He belongs to that honored class whose names may not be written large in the pages of history, but whose work is indelibly stamped upon the legislation of the Nation and permanently interwoven with the best traditions of the country.

Mr. SPARKMAN has been faithful, industrious, and efficient. I never knew a kindlier, more courteous, more considerate gentleman. [Applause.] In all my life I never had the honor of calling my friend a more lovable character than STEPHEN M. SPARKMAN. [Applause.]

And best of all and above all and more valuable than all, when he goes from this House, after 22 years of work well done, he will leave to his family, to those he loves, and to his country he has served so well the priceless heritage of an honest name. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I agree fully to all the good things that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has just said about the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]. It has been my good fortune to serve on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors with both of these distinguished gentlemen for a great many years, and when the gentleman from Washington was paying his tribute of respect to the gentleman from Florida just now, and expressing the universal regret that as the result of the recent election Mr. SPARKMAN goes out from among us, I could not repress the thought that disasters come not singly. [Applause.] I know that I express the unanimous sentiment of this House when I say that it is with the keenest regret that we contemplate the departure from among us of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. [Applause.]

Fourteen years ago he and I came to Congress together. Our association here in the legislation of the country has been more intimate than that of the average Members. We were assigned to the same committees. We have been detailed frequently upon the same subcommittees. The purposes of our legislative efforts were identical along many lines, and I had the opportunity to observe him at close range. I have had the opportunity to serve with him in the committee room, when the doors were locked, and after 14 years of that character of association I take great pleasure, I take pride in saying that during my term of service there has appeared here no man who has more honestly, more earnestly, more faithfully, or more courageously filled up the full measure of the duties of an American Representative than has Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. [Applause.]

As a Republican he was as partisan as the worst of you. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I was almost tempted to say "Amen" when he said a few moments ago that this was the most merciless body in the world. [Laughter.] I have felt that frequently when he was on the floor of the House, backed by the partisanship of his own party here in his vigorous assaults against the Democrats, certainly no advocate upon this floor ever appeared more merciless than he.

But, after all, it is the judgment of those against whom he made his assaults that while he was a foe worthy of their steel, he never hit below the belt. [Applause.] And as he goes out now, I know that he carries with him the best wishes, the heartiest hopes for his success in all things, from the membership of this side as well as of that side of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, now that the Committee of the Whole has completed the consideration of this important bill, it will, I am sure, be regarded as entirely appropriate to make a brief expression regarding the retiring members of the committee, which include the distinguished chairman, Hon. STEPHEN M. SPARKMAN, of Florida. I indorse the complimentary references by Mr. HUMPHREYS, of Mississippi, to the services of our colleague, Hon. WILLIAM E. HUMPHREY, of Washington. He is closing a service in this House of 14 years, which have been filled with industry and zeal for his State and the country. [Applause.]

Our beloved colleague, Hon. GEORGE F. BURGESS, of Texas, is nearing the end of 16 years' continuous service, during which time he has served continuously on this committee with distinction to himself, and his record is most clearly written in the many works of public improvement which he espoused and which were adopted by Congress. [Applause.]

Another colleague, Hon. CHARLES G. EDWARDS, of Georgia, will soon retire with the plaudits of his constituents and the regret of us all. [Applause.]

Our good friend at my right, Hon. CHARLES LIEB, of Indiana, with characteristic zeal, has been diligent in service upon the committee and has established a reputation which will be difficult to surpass. [Applause.]

The genial and able gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. ANDREW J. BARCHFELD, has not only advocated with loyalty the improvement of the Ohio River but has lent his aid to every other worthy project. [Applause.]

The city of Buffalo, upon one of the Great Lakes, will also lose the services of its distinguished Representative, in the person of Hon. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL, of New York. [Applause.]

May I, Mr. Chairman, refer a little more at length to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. SPARKMAN? On March 4 he will have served continuously as a Representative in this House for 22 years, and for 20 years of this time he has been a member of this committee. When elected he was a lawyer with a large practice and highly esteemed by his clients and professional brethren for his mental strength and legal knowledge. While exercising diligence in the discharge of all local obligations to his immediate constituency and always alert to general legislation in this body, it is perhaps fair to say that he has devoted a larger proportion of his time to the study of our harbors and waterways. His trained mind and studious habits enabled him to master the varied data and facts necessary to an intelligent understanding of the merits and demerits of every proposition. He is recognized to-day as a distinguished expert in Congress and in the country upon the subject of waterways, and it is not surprising that as chairman during the past six years he has outlined and presented a constructive program of waterway improvements. Service counts so largely in this legislative body and specialization is so important that the loss of his services will be distinctly marked and will be difficult to replace.

I can not refrain from adverting to one conspicuous phase of his service at this session. Although he is to retire and, so far as his friends know, has discarded further political ambition for the future, yet in the preliminary study and in the formulation of this bill he has, if possible, exhibited even greater zeal and loyalty in service than in past sessions. This is only an example of the unselfish labor and of the consecration to duty which has characterized all the years of the past.

We shall miss his genial smile, his words of cheer, and his attractive personality. Wherever his future paths may lie, I am sure I bespeak the cordial good wishes of all his colleagues in this body, regardless of their political affiliations, that health, peace, contentment, and prosperity may abide with our good friend to the end. [Applause.]

I beg the liberty of appending a paragraph from a recent discriminating editorial on river and harbor legislation from the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News:

It is indeed unfortunate for the country that at the time when rivers and harbors improvement is being successfully urged to a stable business basis it should lose the service of men who have acquired that expertness in the work which Congress is called upon to do, that is indispensable to its best performance. With the expiration of this Congress, for example, Mr. SPARKMAN, the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, will retire, and Congress will lose, in the consideration of waterway measures, the advantage which his valuable knowledge of waterway questions now provides. Pains-taking

application to the responsibilities of his office of chairman of the committee should have made him familiar with virtually every project that has been before Congress for consideration. Obviously this knowledge should make his service invaluable to the country in this important department of its business. His retirement just at the time he is best fitted to serve well in an important station emphasizes a rather glaring imperfection in the political system under which the public seems to be willing for the business of the Government to proceed. The surest and undoubtedly the best means of eliminating all taint of pork from rivers and harbors bills is to give the men who draw them time and opportunity to become expert in the science itself, as well as in the national need of waterway development, and then to keep them on the job.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, before making the motion that the committee finally rise and report this bill to the House, I wish to ask its indulgence for a few minutes while I thank, as I do most sincerely, my good friends the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LIEB], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], and others for the very gracious words they have uttered regarding myself on this floor to-day and at various times since the consideration of this measure was begun. Those were indeed kind words, and I prize them beyond measure, as I do the generous consideration shown me a few days ago in relation to the project for the improvement of the harbor at my home city. This act is the more appreciated, as it came voluntarily and was unsought and unexpected by me, and, besides, brought with it such manifestations of good will and esteem.

The recollection of those kind words and acts will never be forgotten, but will ever be cherished by me as one of the most pleasant memories of the many that have been kindled during my long term of service here.

I wish also to express my appreciation of the kind and courteous treatment of and able assistance rendered me by the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee during the time I have had the honor of presiding over the deliberations of that body. This is one of the most important committees of the House and performs a great work for the country. I believe I risk nothing in saying, Mr. Chairman, that there is no committee of the House whose work is of greater importance to the people, nor one which during the 33 or 34 years of its existence has accomplished more for the country than has the legislation emanating from that committee. I may also add that there is no other committee which entails harder work upon its members and its chairman than does that committee. But though the duties of its chairman are never light, but always exacting and engrossing, they have in my case been rendered much less burdensome by the kind and generous assistance rendered me in their performance by the membership of that body, and to them again, one and all, I wish to express my sincere thanks and the deep appreciation I shall ever feel for the kind aid rendered me by them during the past six years. [Applause.]

Nor can I close, Mr. Chairman, without referring to four or five other members of the committee who will retire from the House at the end of this session and, of course, from membership on that committee. These are my good friends Mr. BURGESS of Texas, Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington, Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia, Mr. DRISCOLL of New York, and last but not least, by any means, my good friend Mr. LIEB of Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, the country can ill afford to lose the services of such men as these. Especially is their retirement a severe loss to their constituencies and to the people of the States they have so ably and worthily represented in this body. I do not know the gentlemen who succeed the retiring Members just mentioned, but no matter how able and efficient they may be, the States they represent will miss their services here. The progressive State of Washington will not find one who will serve her better than has Mr. HUMPHREY, who has represented her so ably and faithfully for the past 14 years. Nor will the Lone Star State find one who will serve her more loyally and more ably, or who will represent her in her efforts to develop her wonderful resources more efficiently than has GEORGE BURGESS. Neither will the great State of Georgia nor the enterprising and growing city of Savannah ever have a better Representative or one who will serve her with greater fidelity and efficiency than has CHARLES EDWARDS, who also retires on the 4th of next March. Equally impossible will it be for the State of Indiana or the district represented by my good friend Mr. LIEB to find a better or a more efficient Representative of her interests, which, of course, includes that great river, the Ohio, to the improvement of which he has given so much of his time and attention during his membership on this floor. My good friend Mr. DRISCOLL, of New York, will also be missed from this body and from the committee, of which he was such a con-

spicuous member, and in the duties of which he has taken such an active and intelligent part. The State of New York and the district which he represents are the losers by his retirement. It has, indeed, been a pleasure, as it has been a distinguished honor, to serve with such men in this body and on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and I voice, I know, the sentiment of each Member here when I wish them every success in whatever field of endeavor they may enter after laying down their duties here.

Concluding, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my thanks not alone to those to whom reference has been especially made by me but also to the entire membership of this body for the kind and courteous treatment I have ever received at their hands. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 20079) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on the question of the passage of the bill I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.]

Two hundred and forty-one Members present, a quorum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

Mr. NORTON. I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 132, answered "present" 3, not voting 77, as follows:

YEAS—221.

Abercrombie	Danforth	Harrison, Va.	McGillicuddy
Adamson	Darrow	Hastings	McKellar
Alexander	Davis, Minn.	Hawley	McLaughlin
Allen	Davis, Tex.	Hayden	McLemore
Almon	Decker	Heaton	Magee
Aswell	Dempsey	Hefflin	Martin
Austin	Denison	Hensley	Matthews
Bacharach	Dent	Hernandez	Meeker
Barkley	Dewalt	Hicks	Miller, Minn.
Bell	Dickinson	Hinds	Montague
Benedict	Dies	Holland	Moon
Bennet	Dixon	Hood	Moore, Pa.
Blackmon	Doelling	Houston	Morgan, La.
Boomer	Doremus	Hughes	Morlin
Borland	Drukker	Hulbert	Mott
Bowers	Dupré	Hull, Tenn.	Mudd
Browning	Dyer	Humphrey, Wash.	Murray
Bruckner	Eagan	Humphreys, Miss.	Neely
Buchanan, Ill.	Eagle	Hutchinson	North
Buchanan, Tex.	Edmonds	Igoe	Oldfield
Burgess	Edwards	Jacoway	Oliver
Burke	Elston	Johnson, Wash.	O'Neary
Byrns, Tenn.	Fairchild	Kearns	O'Shaunessy
Caldwell	Farley	Kelley	Overmyer
Candler, Miss.	Fields	Kennedy, R. I.	Padgett
Capstick	Flood	Kent	Park
Caraway	Freeman	Kettner	Parker, N. Y.
Carlin	Gallivan	Kincheloe	Phelan
Carter, Okla.	Garland	Kitchin	Platt
Chandler, N. Y.	Garner	Konop	Porter
Charles	Garrett	Lafean	Powers
Clark, Fla.	Godwin, N. C.	Langley	Price
Coady	Goodwin, Ark.	Lazaro	Quin
Collier	Gray, Ala.	Lee	Ragsdale
Cooper, W. Va.	Gray, N. J.	Lever	Rainey
Cooper, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	Lieb	Raker
Copley	Greene, Vt.	Linthicum	Randall
Costello	Gregs	Lloyd	Rayburn
Crago	Hadley	Lobeck	Riordan
Crisp	Hamlin	Longworth	Rosenberg
Curry	Hardy	McArthur	Rouse
Dale, Vt.	Harrison, Miss.	McCracken	Rowe

Rubey
Rucker, Ga.
Rucker, Mo.
Russell, Mo.
Saunders
Scott, Pa.
Sears
Shackelford
Siegel
Sims
Sinnott
Slomp
Small
Smith, Idaho

Smith, Tex.
Snell
Snyder
Sparkman
Stegall
Stedman
Steele, Iowa
Steenerson
Stephens, Nebr.
Stiness
Summers
Sutherland
Swift
Switzer

Taggart
Tague
Taylor, Ark.
Thomas
Tillman
Treadway
Van Dyke
Vare
Venable
Vinson
Volstead
Walker
Ward
Watkins

Watson, Pa.
Watson, Va.
Whaley
Williams, W. E.
Williams, Ohio
Wilson, La.
Wingo
Wise
Wood, Ind.
Woodyard
Young, Tex.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. JONES with Mr. HASKELL.

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BUTLER, ending Monday.

Mr. BLACK with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. SPARKMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PENSIONS (H. R. 20451).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 20451, a pension bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20451) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Patrick O'Donohue, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Hundley, late of Company K, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Stephens, late of Company H, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh Kerr, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Baker, widow of John T. Baker, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James E. Washington, late of Company H, Sixty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Woolf, late of Company K, Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clarinda Mahoney, widow of Patrick H. Mahoney, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles W. Mahoney, helpless and dependent child of said Patrick H. Mahoney, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Clarinda Mahoney, the name of said Charles W. Mahoney shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Clarinda Mahoney.

The name of Jackson S. Fugate, late of Company E, Sixty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo Spurgeon, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac H. Orndorff, late of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Lynch, late of Companies C and I, Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Trovillo May, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of Julius Stemple, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis L. Stafford, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Delia M. Yocum, widow of Benjamin F. Yocum, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fannie J. B. Kelley, widow of Edward B. P. Kelley, late surgeon Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Newton Nelson, late of Company B, One hundred and second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Waymire, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael T. Dwyer, late of Company I, Ninety-third Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie L. Tate, helpless and dependent child of Frederick Tate, late of Company I, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edwin W. Rose, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam Rader, late of Company A, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

NAYS—132.

Alken
Anderson
Anthony
Ashbrook
Ayres
Barnhart
Britt
Britten
Browne
Brumbaugh
Byrnes, S. C.
Callaway
Carter, Mass.
Cary
Chapfield
Cline
Connelly
Cramton
Crosser
Dallinger
Dill
Dillon
Doolittle
Doughton
Dowell
Dunn
Ellsworth
Emerson
Evans
Ferris
Fess
Focht
Foss

Foster
Frear
Fuller
Gallagher
Gandy
Gillett
Glynn
Good
Gordon
Green, Iowa
Guernsey
Hamilton, Mich.
Haugen
Helgesen
Helm
Helvering
Hillard
Hollingsworth
Howard
Howell
Huddleston
Hull, Iowa
James
Johnson, S. Dak.
Keating
Keister
Kless, Pa.
King
Kinkaid
Kreider
La Follette
Lenroot
Leshner

Lindbergh
Loud
McAndrews
McClintic
McCulloch
McDermott
Glynn
McKenzie
McKinley
Madden
Mapes
Mays
Miller, Pa.
Moore, Ind.
Morgan, Okla.
Morrison
Nelson
Nicholls, S. C.
Nichols, Mich.
Nolan
Norton
Oakley
Page, N. C.
Palge, Mass.
Parker, N. J.
Ramseyer
Rauch
Reavis
Reilly
Ricketts
Roberts, Nev.
Rogers
Russell, Ohio

Sabbath
Schall
Scott, Mich.
Scully
Shallenberger
Sherley
Sherwood
Sheuse
Sloan
Smith, Mich.
Smith, Minn.
Smith, N. Y.
Stafford
Stephens, Tex.
Sterling
Stone
Sulloway
Sweet
Tavener
Taylor, Colo.
Temple
Thompson
Tilson
Timberlake
Tinkham
Towner
Walsh
Wason
Wheeler
Williams, T. S.
Wilson, Ill.
Woods, Iowa
Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Butler

Cox

NOT VOTING—77.

Adair
Bailey
Barchfeld
Beakes
Beales
Black
Burnett
Campbell
Cannon
Cantrill
Carew
Casey
Church
Coleman
Conry
Cooper, Ohio
Cullop
Dale, N. Y.
Davenport
Driscoll

Esch
Estopinal
Farr
Fitzgerald
Flynn
Fordney
Gard
Gardner
Glass
Gould
Graham
Gray, Ind.
Griest
Griffin
Hamill
Hamilton, N. Y.
Hart
Haskell
Hayes
Heary

Hill
Hopwood
Husted
Johnson, Ky.
Jones
Kahn
Kennedy, Iowa
Key, Ohio
Lehlbach
Lewis
Liebel
Littlepage
Loft
London
Maher
Mann
Mendell
Mooney
Moss
Oglesby

Patten
Peters
Pou
Pratt
Roberts, Mass.
Rowland
Sanford
Sells
Sisson
Slayden
Steele, Pa.
Stephens, Miss.
Stout
Talbot
Webb
Wilson, Fla.
Winslow

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. CANNON with Mr. MILLER of Delaware.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. ESCH, commencing January 24, 1917, ending January 31, 1917.

On this vote:

Mr. FARR (for) with Mr. GARDNER (against).

Mr. GOULD (for) with Mr. PRATT (against).

Mr. BARCHFELD (for) with Mr. SELLS (against).

Mr. HILL (for) with Mr. GRAY of Indiana (against).

Mr. WINSLOW (for) with Mr. STOUT (against).

Mr. CONRY (for) with Mr. HAMILTON of New York (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. BEAKES with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. GARD with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. PATTEN with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. BEALE.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. LEHLBACH.

Mr. SISSON with Mr. HOWWOOD.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. HAYES.

The name of Robert Hird, late of Company E, Second Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Carver, late of Company H, One hundred and eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Bothwell, late of Company A, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Stitsworth, late of Company B, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Lambert, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James R. Mills, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Blue, late of the Sixteenth Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Bosler, late of Company H, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph R. N. Monroe, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Warfield, late of Company G, Sixty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Heber Stoddard, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Torpy, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Gibbs, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Sebastian, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marinda Forest, widow of Samuel J. Forest, late of Company F, Phelps's Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin N. Trout, late of Company F, Forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Maggie A. Hutchings, widow of Moses C. Hutchings, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of N. Benton Yackey, late of Company A, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amasa Johnston, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. Thompson, late of Company D, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter McDaniel, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sidney M. Smith, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Peterson, late of Company A, One hundred and twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Dow, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Brice Vance, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Nethercutt, widow of George W. Nethercutt, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Orrin P. Gay, late of Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Frantz, late of Weaver's Independent Company, Pennsylvania Mounted Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Maris, late of Company L, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David C. Morgan, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Field, late of Third Battery, First Battalion, Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Banks, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Cole, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac R. Nichols, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Minerva Lavine, widow of Moses Lavine, late of Company C, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda M. Eaton, widow of Crittenden B. Eaton, late of Company I, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles B. Black, late of Company C, Fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry B. Pitner, late of Company F, One hundred and fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oakaley Randall, late of Company P, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Fife, late of Company K, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hampton B. Farmer, late of Company H, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jackson Allen, late of Company A, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Porcupine, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Nickols, helpless and dependent child of John Nickols, late of Company D, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Aaron Britton, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Penry, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius O'Shea, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. E. Guest, late of Capt. Gilbreath's Company, Alabama Volunteer Scouts and Guides, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aletha J. Honeycutt, widow of John M. Honeycutt, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Koontz, widow of Phillip Koontz, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company M, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Leela Koontz, helpless and dependent child of said Phillip Koontz, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Emma Koontz, the name of said Leela Koontz shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Emma Koontz.

The name of Andrew J. Florey, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis E. Salsbury, late of Company D, Thirty-second Regiment, and Company D, Thirty-first Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas W. Patterson, late of Company H, First Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Morris, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Ball, late of Company I, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Newton E. Eldred, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas H. Glenn, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Zachariah D. Barnhart, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Kelley, late of Company G, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Oyster, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace A. Brockway, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Madison T. Trent, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment, and Company E, Eighth Regiment, Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas H. Boyd, late of Company C, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James L. Cornell, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melissa L. Yates, widow of Daniel Yates, late of Company G, Sixty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Emil Yates, helpless and dependent child of said Daniel Yates, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Melissa L. Yates, the name of said Emil Yates shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Melissa L. Yates.

The name of Alexander Little, late of Companies B and D, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milton B. Smith, late of United States Signal Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amaziah Shaeffer, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harris Cole, alias Henry Little, late of Company C, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Van Gorder, late of Company K, Fiftieth Regiment New York Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caroline A. Jones, widow of Edward F. Jones, late of Company E, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Skelton, late acting third assistant engineer, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Wise, late of Company H, Sixtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. McCullah, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Catharine Lovell, dependent mother of John N. Lovell, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William W. Clark, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emergene J. Mitchell, widow of William H. Mitchell, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Connor, late of Company B, First Regiment Maryland Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Voneky, widow of Louis Voneky, late major Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George C. Jackman, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam K. Bayler, late acting master's mate, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Uriah E. Jones, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Cramer, late of Companies A and F, Sixty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucy Tarsney, widow of Thomas Tarsney, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clarinda Branch, widow of Levi Branch, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Plummer, late of Company M, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan G. Martin, late of Company K, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Wisner, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert P. Jackson, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Haar, late of Company I, Two hundred and ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edgar G. Spaid, late of Company B, Ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey Enyart, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Swain, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Cole, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of De Witt C. Carpenter, late of Company I, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sanford L. Holstine, late of Company G, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore Kiefer, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George N. Stevens, late of Company E, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Taylor, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Echols, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Lodoiska W. Gibson, widow of Fenton W. Gibson, late of Company C, Second Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, and

Company A, First Regiment New Orleans, La., Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Neely, late of Company C, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Lauver, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ogden C. Lowell, late first-class boy, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Johnson, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Blauser, late of band Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Coble, late of Company B, Two hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucius Keplar, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The names of Minnie E. Pinkerton, helpless and dependent, and Eugene P. Pinkerton, children of James P. Pinkerton, late of Company A, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Infantry, and pay them a pension at the rate of \$24 per month until the said Eugene P. Pinkerton attains the age of 16 years, in lieu of that they are now receiving: *Provided*, that in the event of the death of Minnie E. Pinkerton the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, that in the event of the death of Eugene P. Pinkerton, or upon his attaining the age of 16 years, the name of Minnie E. Pinkerton shall be continued on the pension roll during the period of her helplessness and dependence, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$14 per month from and after the date of death of Eugene P. Pinkerton, or from and after the date he attains the age of 16 years.

The name of Margaret I. Reider, widow of Emanuel Reider, late of Company C, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$32 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, that in the event of the death of Harry W. Reider, helpless and dependent child of said Emanuel Reider, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, that in the event of the death of Margaret I. Reider the name of said Harry W. Reider shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the death of said Margaret I. Reider.

The name of George M. Fell, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Summers, late of Company K, One hundred and second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Miller, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Cavalry, and Company F, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Bush, helpless and dependent child of William A. Bush, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ferdinand Effinger, late of Companies I and K, Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Smith, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aretas J. Porter, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles D. Ashton, late of Company H, First Regiment Connecticut Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lycurgus W. Severns, late of Company E, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Allen, widow of Francis Allen, late of Company G, Third Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George C. Wachob, late of Company B, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Walker, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Himmelheber, late of Company H, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elias Ellis, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charlotte M. Eckstine, widow of Robert O. P. Eckstine, late of Company A, Ninth Legion Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James A. Wildman, helpless and dependent child of James Wildman, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward Barr, late of Company F, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Howland, widow of John C. Howland, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Webster, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oliver Shirkey, late of Company A, Sixtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caleb A. Hesser, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Walls, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca Zellers, helpless and dependent child of Isaac Zellers, late of Company D, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frederick Hartman, late of Company A, Two hundred and ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lott Todd, late of Company B, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wellington Hay, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin H. Miner, late of Company F, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura C. Whittier, widow of George A. Whittier, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Michel, late of Company G, Second Battalion, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Goodin, late of Company A, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Morton, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rosannah Heidler, widow of John F. Heidler, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Troops E and I, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Orin Holmes, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leander McCants, late of Company B, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William P. Brittain, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel M. Carson, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph M. Alexander, late of Company M, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Frohs, widow of Michael Frohs, late of Company F, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Lottie E. Newell, widow of George Newell, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, Second Regiment New York Provisional Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan Carr, late of Company I, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Cooper, late of Company B, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Rhodes, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Barr, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Rolfe, late of Company I, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Florence S. L'Hommiedieu, widow of Stephen S. L'Hommiedieu, late major, Eighty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charlotte A. Lansing, widow of George J. Lansing, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of James Chadwick, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Timothy J. Hurlbut, late of Company C, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alvin Green, late of Company A, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Rickman, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Scott Farmer, helpless and dependent child of Eli Farmer, late of Company K, Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sarah Robinson, widow of Charles A. Robinson, alias Charles Robbins, late of Company G, Second Regiment New York Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Francis E. Lamb, late of Company C, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Adler, late of Company M, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Tilson M. Sutherland, late of Companies F and M, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thompson P. Burtch, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment, and Company C, Sixty-eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Loretta S. Ducolon, widow of Levi Ducolon, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Albert E. Worsham, late master at arms, United States Revenue Cutter Service, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Hamm, widow of Benjamin N. Hamm, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Brown, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James J. Hollywood, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram Corbin, late unassigned, First Regiment Michigan Engineers and Mechanics, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Wheeler, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John West, late first-class fireman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Hibbard, late of Company K, Fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lorenzo D. Wentworth, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher D. Veal, late of Company I, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas D. Tweedy, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Freed, widow of Henry H. Freed, late of Company D, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Sophia Moldenhauer, former widow of Gottlieb Brettag, late of Company K, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Silas Crisler, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. McAninch, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Effie H. Woodruff, widow of Carl A. Woodruff, late of Light Battery F, Second Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Sherrard, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harrison McOwen, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Daniels, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Libby, late of Companies H and G, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Dickson, widow of Ezra Dickson, late of Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James M. Irvine, late of Company M, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Fultz, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Cooper, late of Company D, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan C. Rucker, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Terhune, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George F. Hood, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Eppens, widow of Henry Eppens, late of Company D, Battalion, One hundred and sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$32 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Emma Eppens, helpless and dependent child of said Henry Eppens, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Margaret Eppens, the name of said Emma Eppens shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Margaret Eppens.

The name of Silas D. A. Allen, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Pratt, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David H. Keefer, Jr., late of Company A, One hundred and forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a

pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice J. Stoddard, widow of Nelson Stoddard, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Watson F. Bisbee, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Ellen Everich, widow of James S. Everich, late of Company B, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen Sicher, helpless and dependent child of William Sicher, late of Company K, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Spelman, late of United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Hodges, late of Company A, Fifty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Pelkey, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calloway Roddy, late of Company D, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Price, late of Company G, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and United States Signal Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas A. Weisner, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eunice E. Dodge, widow of Rodolph L. Dodge, late of Company C, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James F. Doyle, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rosa L. Wells, former widow of George R. Russell, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Susannah Ditterline, widow of Smith F. Ditterline, late of Company P, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William J. Winters, late of Company A, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan Wells, late of Company G, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Ray, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fannie Brosius, widow of Joseph Brosius, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy Hulett, dependent mother of Benjamin Hulett, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Spriggs, helpless and dependent child of Lewis Spriggs, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James H. Wood, late of Company G, First Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louisa M. Tobey, widow of Elisha H. Tobey, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment, and Company E, Sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mabel Nolin, helpless and dependent child of John Nolin, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Henry, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David H. Tullis, late of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Stuchall, late of Company G, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles W. Everson, late of Company B, Forty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of August Krause, late of Company G, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob F. Minch, late of Company F, Forty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Smith, widow of Oscar Smith, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Edward C. Roll, late of Company H, Fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Pence, late of Company A, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Wharton, late of Company G, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Heis, late of Company L, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Veteran Re-

serve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie S. Hight, widow of John J. Hight, late of Companies D and B, Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Easton, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Jerome, late regimental quartermaster, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silo P. Warriner, late of Companies G and K, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Watson Goodrich, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry; Company K, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry; Company K, Fourth United States Colored Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Herman G. Weller, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Harman, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Vanatta, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alden Youngman, late of Company E, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac O'Neal, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred P. Haskill, late of Company B, Second Regiment United States Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank R. Barfoot, late of Company G, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Barker, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Boyce, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Davy, late of Company B, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frances Getchell, widow of Eugene B. Getchell, late of Company G, Maine Coast Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 1542. Patrick O'Donohue.	H. R. 9766. Lewis Cole.
H. R. 1799. John Hundley.	H. R. 10278. Isaac R. Nichols.
H. R. 1833. William L. Stephens.	H. R. 10295. Minerva Lavine.
H. R. 1896. Hugh Kerr.	H. R. 10472. Amanda M. Eaton.
H. R. 1912. Mary E. Baker.	H. R. 10520. Charles B. Black.
H. R. 2011. James E. Washington.	H. R. 10527. Henry B. Pitner.
H. R. 2026. William Woolf.	H. R. 10633. Oakaley Randall.
H. R. 2280. Clarinda Mahoney.	H. R. 10870. Albert Fife.
H. R. 3455. Jackson S. Fugate.	H. R. 11282. Hampton B. Farmer.
H. R. 3757. Alonzo Spurgeon.	H. R. 11295. Jackson Allen.
H. R. 3886. Isaac H. Orndorff.	H. R. 11398. James H. Porcupine.
H. R. 3995. James M. Lynch.	H. R. 11484. William F. Nichols.
H. R. 4001. Trovillo May.	H. R. 11684. Aaron Britton.
H. R. 4080. Julius Stemple.	H. R. 11834. John P. Penry.
H. R. 4219. Louis L. Stafford.	H. R. 11925. Cornelius O'Shea.
H. R. 4557. Della M. Yocum.	H. R. 12055. James H. E. Guest.
H. R. 4565. Fannie J. B. Kelley.	H. R. 12371. Aletha J. Honeycutt.
H. R. 4630. Newton Nelson.	H. R. 12535. Emma Koontz.
H. R. 4845. Martin Waymire.	H. R. 12560. Andrew J. Florey.
H. R. 5054. Michael T. Dwyer.	H. R. 12568. Francis E. Salsbury.
H. R. 5255. Jennie L. Tate.	H. R. 12635. Thomas W. Patterson.
H. R. 5316. Edwin W. Rose.	H. R. 12720. William H. Morris.
H. R. 5334. Adam Rader.	H. R. 12733. John C. Ball.
H. R. 5665. Robert Hird.	H. R. 13101. Newton E. Eldred.
H. R. 5697. Charles Carver.	H. R. 13268. Thomas H. Glenn.
H. R. 5863. Charles H. Bothwell.	H. R. 13310. Zachariah D. Barnhart.
H. R. 6105. James A. Stitsworth.	H. R. 13409. Thomas Kelley.
H. R. 6200. William T. Lambert.	H. R. 13502. Daniel Oyster.
H. R. 6246. James R. Mills.	H. R. 13561. Horace A. Brockway.
H. R. 6398. James Blue.	H. R. 13951. Madison T. Trent.
H. R. 6500. John W. Bosler.	H. R. 13971. James L. Cornell.
H. R. 6654. Joseph R. N. Monroe.	H. R. 14062. Thomas H. Boyd.
H. R. 6659. James W. Warfield.	H. R. 14097. Melissa L. Yates.
H. R. 6741. Heber Stoddard.	H. R. 14102. Alexander Little.
H. R. 7026. Daniel Torpy.	H. R. 14165. Milton B. Smith.
H. R. 7204. Abraham Gibbs.	H. R. 14185. Amaziah Shaeffer.
H. R. 7208. John F. Sebastian.	H. R. 14198. Harris Cole, alias Henry Little.
H. R. 7385. Marinda Forest.	H. R. 14201. John W. Van Gorder.
H. R. 7412. Benjamin N. Trout.	H. R. 14211. Caroline A. Jones.
H. R. 7662. Maggie A. Hutchings.	H. R. 14259. William Skelton.
H. R. 7878. N. Benton Yackey.	H. R. 14280. James A. Wise.
H. R. 7910. Amasa Johnston.	H. R. 14374. James W. McCullah.
H. R. 7949. John G. Thompson.	H. R. 14385. Catharine Lovell.
H. R. 7965. Walter McDaniel.	H. R. 14442. William W. Clark.
H. R. 8400. Sidney M. Smith.	H. R. 14545. Emergene J. Mitchell.
H. R. 8723. John A. Peterson.	H. R. 14743. John Connor.
H. R. 8789. George W. Dow.	H. R. 14789. Elizabeth Voneky.
H. R. 8870. Brice Vance.	H. R. 14813. George C. Jackman.
H. R. 8969. Sarah E. Nethercutt.	H. R. 14882. Adam K. Bayler.
H. R. 9002. Orrin P. Gay.	H. R. 15035. Uriah E. Jones.
H. R. 9179. Jacob Frantz.	H. R. 15090. James Cranmer.
H. R. 9292. Charles E. Maris.	H. R. 15025. Lucy Tarsney.
H. R. 9380. David C. Morgan.	H. R. 15327. Clarinda Brauch.
H. R. 9488. Robert Field.	H. R. 15501. George W. Plummer.
H. R. 9566. Peter Banks.	

H. R. 15516. Nathan G. Martin.
 H. R. 15541. Joseph A. Wisner.
 H. R. 15547. Albert P. Jackson.
 H. R. 15567. Jacob Haar.
 H. R. 15655. Edgar G. Spaid.
 H. R. 15906. Harvey Enyart.
 H. R. 15970. John L. Swain.
 H. R. 16011. Frank Cole.
 H. R. 16020. De Witt C. Carpenter.
 H. R. 16039. Sanford L. Holstine.
 H. R. 16311. Theodore Klefer.
 H. R. 16360. George N. Stevens.
 H. R. 16389. John W. Taylor.
 H. R. 16390. John W. Echols.
 H. R. 16498. Lodolska W. Gibson.
 H. R. 16547. George W. Neely.
 H. R. 16617. Daniel Lauver.
 H. R. 16625. Ogden C. Lowell.
 H. R. 16651. John W. Johnson.
 H. R. 16726. Edward Blauser.
 H. R. 16730. George W. Coble.
 H. R. 17050. Lucius Keplar.
 H. R. 17064. Minnie E. Pinkerton.
 H. R. 17145. Eugene P. Pinkerton.
 H. R. 17223. Margaret I. Reider.
 H. R. 17230. George M. Fell.
 H. R. 17297. John C. Summers.
 H. R. 17297. George W. Miller.
 H. R. 17328. James M. Bush.
 H. R. 17403. Ferdinand Effinger.
 H. R. 17447. James M. Smith.
 H. R. 17467. Aretas J. Porter.
 H. R. 17483. Charles D. Ashton.
 H. R. 17507. Lycurgus W. Severns.
 H. R. 17693. Sarah E. Allen.
 H. R. 17725. George C. Wachob.
 H. R. 17737. Robert Walker.
 H. R. 17868. Jacob Himmelheber.
 H. R. 17869. Elias Ellis.
 H. R. 17877. Charlotte M. Eckstine.
 H. R. 17878. James A. Wildman.
 H. R. 17890. Edward Barr.
 H. R. 17895. Catherine Howland.
 H. R. 17896. George W. Webster.
 H. R. 17898. Oliver Shirley.
 H. R. 17902. Caleb A. Hesser.
 H. R. 17904. Charles Walls.
 H. R. 17915. Rebecca Zellers.
 H. R. 17922. Frederick Hartman.
 H. R. 17961. Lott Todd.
 H. R. 18042. Wellington Hay.
 H. R. 18047. Edwin H. Miner.
 H. R. 18053. Laura C. Whittier.
 H. R. 18069. Charles Michel.
 H. R. 18121. William Goodin.
 H. R. 18122. John W. Morton.
 H. R. 18128. Rosannah Heldler.
 H. R. 18138. Orin Holmes.
 H. R. 18153. Leander McCants.
 H. R. 18156. William P. Brittain.
 H. R. 18211. Samuel M. Carson.
 H. R. 18233. Joseph M. Alexander.
 H. R. 18245. Anna Frohs.
 H. R. 18261. Lottie E. Newell.
 H. R. 18262. Jonathan Carr.
 H. R. 18266. Abraham Cooper.
 H. R. 18280. Abraham Rhodes.
 H. R. 18283. Henry Barr.
 H. R. 18292. James T. Rolif.
 H. R. 18313. Florence S. L'Hon-
 medieu.
 H. R. 18323. Charlotte A. Lansing.
 H. R. 18327. James Chadwick.
 H. R. 18335. Timothy J. Hurlbut.
 H. R. 18361. Alvin Green.
 H. R. 18362. William H. Rickman.
 H. R. 18391. Scott Farmer.
 H. R. 18400. Sarah Robinson.
 H. R. 18412. Francis E. Lamb.
 H. R. 18511. Henry Adler.
 H. R. 18518. Tilson M. Sutherland.
 H. R. 18524. Thompson P. Burch.
 H. R. 18562. Loretta S. Ducolon.
 H. R. 18573. Albert E. Worsham.
 H. R. 18582. Sarah E. Hamm.
 H. R. 18622. John Brown.
 H. R. 18623. James J. Hollywood.
 H. R. 18646. Hiram Corbin.
 H. R. 18659. John D. Wheeler.
 H. R. 18698. John West.
 H. R. 18713. James A. Hibbard.
 H. R. 18763. Lorenzo D. Went-
 worth.
 H. R. 18789. Christopher D. Veal.
 H. R. 18799. Thomas D. Tweedy.
 H. R. 18801. Sarah E. Freed.
 H. R. 18840. Anna Sophia Molden-
 bauer.
 H. R. 18848. Silas Crisler.
 H. R. 18851. George W. McAninch.
 H. R. 18866. Effie H. Woodruff.
 H. R. 18925. George W. Sherrard.
 H. R. 18951. Harrison McOwen.
 H. R. 18962. George Daniels.
 H. R. 18965. Daniel Libby.
 H. R. 18972. Margaret Dickson.
 H. R. 19003. James M. Irvine.
 H. R. 19004. William M. Fultz.
 H. R. 19006. Samuel Cooper.
 H. R. 19012. Nathan C. Rucker.
 H. R. 19022. Andrew Terhune.
 H. R. 19047. George F. Hood.
 H. R. 19085. Margaret Eppens.
 H. R. 19089. Silas D. A. Allen.
 H. R. 19099. Henry Pratt.
 H. R. 19102. David H. Keller, jr.
 H. R. 19135. Alice J. Stoddard.
 H. R. 19151. Watson F. Blisbee.
 H. R. 19169. Sarah Ellen Everich.
 H. R. 19200. Ellen Sicher.
 H. R. 19204. John Spelman.
 H. R. 19221. Elijah Hodges.
 H. R. 19227. Isaac Pelkey.
 H. R. 19244. Calloway Roddy.
 H. R. 19245. Charles Price.
 H. R. 19277. Thomas A. Weisner.
 H. R. 19325. Eunice E. Dodge.
 H. R. 19386. James F. Doyle.
 H. R. 19405. Rosa L. Wells.
 H. R. 19437. Susannah Dittlerline.
 H. R. 19464. William J. Winters.
 H. R. 19473. Jonathan Wells.
 H. R. 19474. Joseph Ray.
 H. R. 19479. Fannie Brosius.
 H. R. 19480. Lucy Hulet.
 H. R. 19481. Lewis Spriggs.
 H. R. 19502. James H. Wood.
 H. R. 19505. Louisa M. Tobey.
 H. R. 19555. Mabel Nolin.
 H. R. 19571. Charles Henry.
 H. R. 19577. David H. Tullis.
 H. R. 19612. William A. Stuchall.
 H. R. 19624. Charles W. Everson.
 H. R. 19626. August Krause.
 H. R. 19627. Jacob F. Minch.
 H. R. 19629. Anna Smith.
 H. R. 19637. Edward C. Roll.
 H. R. 19662. John W. Pence.
 H. R. 19663. John Wharton.
 H. R. 19664. Peter Hels.
 H. R. 19735. Lizzie S. Hight.
 H. R. 19739. George W. Easton.
 H. R. 19741. Charles W. Jerome.
 H. R. 19746. Silo P. Warriner.
 H. R. 19774. Watson Goodrich.
 H. R. 19806. Thomas Hamman.
 H. R. 19807. William Vanatta.
 H. R. 19821. Alden Youngman.
 H. R. 19992. Herman G. Weller.
 H. R. 20005. Isaac O'Neal.
 H. R. 20053. Alfred P. Haskill.
 H. R. 20061. Frank R. Barfoot.
 H. R. 20065. Francis M. Barker.
 H. R. 20170. Charles Boyce.
 H. R. 20282. William A. Davy.
 H. R. 20316. Frances Getchell.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.
 The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William Woolf, late of Company K, Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of asking the genial gentleman in charge of this bill a few questions with reference to the procedure in the preparation of these pension bills. I know he will be glad to give us the information. I see that there have been introduced in the House more than 20,000 bills all told. Perhaps three-fourths of them, or 15,000, are pension bills. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill, in the first place, what clerical help the committee has.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The Committee on Invalid Pensions has a special examiner detailed from the Pension Office, a stenographer, and two clerks.

Mr. HASTINGS. Now as to the procedure in committee in the consideration of these bills. Suppose, for the sake of argument, a Member of the House introduces a bill in May or in December or any time in the past, this bill is referred to his

committee. As a matter of course, it is not considered until the required affidavits are filed.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is true.

Mr. HASTINGS. After the affidavits are filed, I would like to have some information from the committee about what their rule for consideration is. In other words, the point I am trying to get at is whether or not they are considered in the order that the affidavits are filed that accompany the several pension bills.

Mr. ASHBROOK. They are considered in the order that the Member requests to have them considered.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to say now that during my membership of this House I have not been opposed to pension legislation. It is not my purpose now to oppose this legislation in asking these questions, but I want to register my protest against any favoritism whatever in favor of one old soldier as against another. I believe that the old soldiers of my State and of my district are entitled to the same consideration as are the old soldiers from any part of this Union.

Mr. Speaker, while I am upon my feet permit me to say that I have introduced some 6 or 8 or 10 pension bills at this session of Congress, and I have the record before me where these affidavits that are required by the committee were secured, where they have been filed with the committee, some two or three weeks or a month ago, and yet none of them has been considered. I want to invite the attention of the committee and the House to the fact that pension bills introduced less than a week before this bill was reported have been favorably considered and are included in this omnibus bill. I invite the attention of the House to the last item of this bill, H. R. 20316. That bill was introduced on January 19, and it was reported out in this bill on January 24. Of course it may be an accident, and of course it can be explained by members of the committee, but it so happens that the Member who introduced that particular bill is a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I want to invite attention also to the next bill before that, H. R. 20282. That bill was introduced on January 18, and in six days thereafter it was favorably considered and the name added to this omnibus pension bill and brought in here to-day for action. I want to invite attention, Mr. Speaker, to H. R. 20171. That bill was introduced on January 16. Eight days thereafter the bill was favorably reported and is included as one of the items in this omnibus bill. It so happens that the Member who introduced that bill is the same Member who introduced the last item in this bill, so that he introduced two bills within eight days prior to the making of the report upon this bill, both of which were favorably acted upon. I have a number of other bills here that show they were introduced within 10 or 12 days prior to the report upon this bill that have been favorably considered and the names added to this omnibus bill, whereas I have a number of bills before me that I introduced, for which I secured the necessary affidavits, which I sent down to the committee with a letter, and I went down there myself and asked their consideration, and I have also sent my secretary a number of times and telephoned the committee a number of times and have asked for their consideration. I want to say now, Mr. Speaker, that I was reared out in the West where we are opposed to any kind of partiality whatsoever, and while I am not opposed to pension legislation—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to any kind of partiality even in the section of the country where I come from, and I believe these pension bills should be considered in the order in which these affidavits are filed. I do not believe that the examiner which is furnished by the Government and I do not believe the clerks that are paid by the Government ought to be allowed to take these bills up out of their order and consider them to the exclusion of the consideration of other meritorious claims. I appreciate that perhaps this committee has not sufficient clerical force, but they ought to be taken up in their order, and that is the complaint that I am now making to the House. I want to say again that while I am not seeking to exercise that right now, and I do not say that the committee shall favorably consider the bills which I have introduced, yet I insist and I have the right to demand that they be considered and reported either favorably or rejected. I want consideration of them and I am entitled to consideration of them. I have a number of letters here that are distressing in their tone, letters from old soldiers without any property at all who are writing to me week after week asking what has been done with the bills

that I months ago introduced. I have in mind one case where the claim was rejected by the committee because the old soldier had not served 90 days. I refer now to page 7 of the committee's report. I find the case of H. R. 3757, where the report shows that the soldier had served less than 90 days, and that he had property valued at \$1,500, and yet his pension is increased to \$30 a month, and the claim of the old soldier for whom I introduced a bill is rejected. I am protesting against this favoritism, and I want to say now that this House will have to have a quorum to consider the next invalid pension bills unless these cases I have introduced are considered.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Oklahoma that I am advised by the clerk of the committee that several of the bills introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma were rejected. If our friend from Oklahoma will appear before the committee when it meets every Monday, we will be very glad to have him do so, and he can there state his case, and we will give him the best of consideration. I am certain that there is no desire to play favorites in this committee. We are anxious to pass bills for every Member of the House. I personally have solicited a number of Members to hand in their evidence and get their bills in shape to be considered, and we have gone out of our way to help the Members who were anxious to have special pension bills passed. The gentleman refers to some bills that were introduced just a few days ago, some time during this month. There is no denying that fact. I do not know the circumstances, but undoubtedly these bills were introduced by some Member who had not had very many bills passed, but they were meritorious bills, and he requested to have them written up in preference to other bills that he had introduced. The gentleman asks and insists that the committee shall take up and consider these bills in the order in which they are introduced—

Mr. HASTINGS. I did not say introduced; I said in the order that the testimony or affidavits were filed.

Mr. ASHBROOK. As I said to my friend a while ago, the examiner writes up these bills in the order they are requested to be written up by the Member, and when the Member indicates to the examiner the bills that he wants written up his wishes will be respected. I assure the gentleman that there is no desire to play favoritism in this committee.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. By the gentleman's statement a Member has to go and appear in person before the examiner and ask that some particular bill receive favorable consideration.

Mr. ASHBROOK. If the gentleman does not file the necessary evidence that is required to be filed accompanying his bill, his bill will not be considered, but I know that the clerk endeavors to see every Member who has a bill pending and see that some of his bills are passed.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. If the evidence, sworn affidavits, were filed with the committee, then that bill will receive proper consideration?

Mr. ASHBROOK. It will in due time; but the examiner, I believe, waits some time until he hears from the Member to know what bills he wants written up. A great many Members file evidence for five or ten times as many bills as could possibly be passed in one session, and the examiner can not devote all his time to writing up bills for a single Member, but waits to learn from the Member the bills he wishes written up.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. The point I was getting at is this: Many of us suppose after we introduce a bill and then file all the necessary evidence that that was all that was necessary for the bill to receive proper consideration. Now, if I understand the gentleman that it is necessary for us to go down before the examiner, then I want that fact to be stated.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say to my friend that he does not necessarily have to appear in person, but if he would write the clerk of the committee or the examiner and request certain bills to be written up I am sure he will have no cause for complaint.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit further, in reference to bill No. 3757, the report shows that he served less than 90 days—I think it was 2 months and 16 days. Now, in this case the party has \$1,500 worth of property, and the committee gives him a pension of \$30 a month, but in this case of mine here the man served 75 days, or one day less, and the claim was rejected because he served less than 90 days, and the proof was before the committee that he does not have a dollar's worth of property.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I happen to know about the case to which the gentleman alludes. This soldier has an honorable discharge showing that he served four months and

one day, but a part of that time he was home on a furlough, and for a number of years he received a pension of \$12 a month. It was discovered a portion of the time that he served he was home on furlough, and for that reason he was dropped. I do not believe it is right to drop a soldier when his honorable discharge shows that he served four months and one day.

Mr. WINGO. Is the gentleman's committee now meeting that kind of a situation?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Not often.

Mr. WINGO. It has been the policy of the committee heretofore to refuse any relief to that kind of a case?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Oh, no; the committee has acted favorably on special bills where the soldier served less than 90 days. He may have been discharged for disability and served less than that time, and his case may be one of special distress; he may be helpless and without any income or property. In this case this soldier happens to have a home, and he is clearly entitled to a pension, because I have seen his discharge and it shows that he served four months and one day.

Mr. WINGO. Let me ask the gentleman if the committee has ever had occasion to pass upon this state of facts, where the soldier was in the Army only a short time, less than 90 days, and was detained at home on account of pneumonia and was not able to return until his regiment went into a territory where he could not possibly reach it on account of the hostile occupancy of the country intervening. Is that man to be blamed and dropped from the pension rolls?

Mr. ASHBROOK. If he was home on his furlough and had an honorable discharge, I believe he should receive a pension; but if he does not have an honorable discharge, then he is not entitled to a pension.

Mr. WINGO. Because he could not get to his command?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I appreciate there are many deserving cases of that kind where soldiers have been regarded as deserters when in fact they were not.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman think that when satisfactory proof is offered that they are not in fact deserters, but owing to a condition over which they had no control, growing out of the war, they were prevented from reaching their commands—does not the gentleman think those men ought to be entitled to some consideration?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do; but that is for the War Department to consider, and if the department rejects it—

Mr. WINGO. Well, what recourse would they have in order to get relief?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well, the recourse would be in the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FIELDS. That belongs to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WINGO. But the gentleman overlooks this. The Committee on Military Affairs is not going into a question like that, because it would bring in those who deserve pensions in a great many instances and those who do not, but in this instance where you have proof that the soldier has served more than 90 days, proof that he got an honorable discharge, but by reason of circumstances over which he had absolutely no control—that is, the occupation of the territory between his home and his command by the enemy—does the gentleman think that man should be absolutely denied justice by the committee?

Mr. ASHBROOK. The difference between the case complained of by my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] and the one stated by my friend from Arkansas is that in the first case the soldier had an honorable discharge and showed that he served four months and one day. In the other case the soldier does not have an honorable discharge.

Mr. WINGO. And I agree with the gentleman, there is a difference there. I can see that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. MAPES. I ask that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended for two minutes for the purpose of asking him a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may be extended for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAPES. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the report on H. R. 4001, on page 7 of the report. It appears that this soldier served only from April 17 to June 14, 1861, or a period of 58 days. I have been told that it was the policy of the committee not to grant a pension to any veteran who served less than 90 days unless he served within a very few days of the 90 days—from 85 to 90.

Mr. ASHBROOK. If the gentleman will read the first paragraph of the report on House bill 4001, he will see that this soldier was discharged on a surgeon's certificate of disability.

Mr. MAPES. I have read that, if the gentleman please; but he has been unable to get a pension under the general law from the Bureau of Pensions because of any disability. The statement in the report that he is now disabled because of old age and other infirmities makes no better showing why he should receive a pension than most any other Civil War veteran could make who has reached the age that most of the veterans of the Civil War have reached.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The discharge shows that this soldier was discharged on a surgeon's certificate of disability.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. POWERS. To ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio have two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] have two minutes more in order that he may be interrogated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POWERS. I just wanted to know from the gentleman about what time he expects to report out the next bill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. There will probably be one more bill two weeks from to-day, which will be the last bill.

Mr. JAMES. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question regarding the case referred to by the gentleman from Oklahoma. You say you are familiar with the case personally?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am.

Mr. JAMES. Was this gentleman home on furlough because of sickness, wounds, or business?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I really could not answer.

Mr. JAMES. I thought you were familiar with the case?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am familiar with it to the extent I stated. He was home on a furlough.

Mr. JAMES. You do not know why?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do not know why.

Mr. JAMES. The law requires he shall have 90 days actual service.

Mr. ASHBROOK. He was in the service, subject to the order of the United States.

Mr. JAMES. It is different than 90 days actual service. It is not 90 days from the time of enlistment to date of discharge. It is 90 days actual service.

Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. DAVIS of Texas rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask for recognition. Am I entitled to it?

The SPEAKER. The rule is that where there is an amendment—

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. Do I understand that the committee is beginning to recognize special bills for men who have not seen 90 days full service?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Oh, yes. I am serving my fifth term, and in my first term I had a bill passed for a soldier who served 89 days. It is not a recent innovation.

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand that heretofore your committee has considered that soldiers who are home on furloughs were not rendering service to the Government—that that was not counted.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am not aware that that has been the position of the committee.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that I have had bills rejected by the committee because the claimant had not seen 90 days of service; because part of that 90 days was when the soldier was on furlough and at home, and I wanted to know if the committee has reversed itself on that point.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The case called to the attention of the House by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] answers your inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS. They rejected this case of mine on that ground alone. Although this old soldier served 75 days, and does not have a dollar's worth of property, the committee rejected that claim upon the ground that he had not served the 90 days.

Mr. ASHBROOK. May I inquire of you whether or not the discharge certificate of this soldier shows that he served only 75 days?

Mr. HASTINGS. Seventy-five days, as I now recall.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I think I am stating the facts now, when I say the Committee has never ventured to act upon a case of a soldier who did not serve 80 days or more; I think 84 or 85 days is the limit.

Mr. ANTHONY. If I am correct, the War Department does not consider it service when a soldier is at home upon furlough.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am aware of the fact. That is the fact, and that is the reason why this soldier was dropped from the rolls.

Mr. ANTHONY. The reason why I ask is that I can hardly understand why some cases are made fish of and others are made fowl.

Mr. GORDON. They are "fish" if they come from the committee and "fowl" if they do not. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. DAVIS of Texas rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] has the floor for five minutes in his own right.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] first.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I would like to have relief or information in a case like this: An old veteran, who had served perhaps a year and a half, happened to be on detail with a wagon with two other soldiers, and when the war closed the wagon ran over him. At any rate, he was left sick, and the other two, reporting for him, failed to report his situation. Hence, he is reported absent, or marked as a deserter. What is the relief in his case?

Mr. ASHBROOK. If he is on the rolls as a deserter, he has no right to a pension under the general law and has none in this committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Could he not prove his actual service and his innocence of the charge of desertion?

Mr. ASHBROOK. If those facts can be proven, he would be given an honorable discharge, and then would have a status on the rolls and would be pensionable.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Then, you would correct his record?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; correct his record at the War Department.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am bound to yield first to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if it is not feasible and just to direct the clerk of the committee to go through that list and see that every Member who is not a member of the committee gets some part of the next bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say that since I have been on this committee I know that the present clerk is very diligent indeed in his efforts to get these bills distributed equally around among the Members. He calls them up on the telephone, and writes to them and speaks to them, and I do that myself; and we will be very glad to get every "finger in the pie" if the gentlemen will tell us what they want. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. I have no grievance to urge against the committee at all.

Mr. ASHBROOK. No; I do not believe the gentleman has any occasion to have any grievance against the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. The committee has been very kind to me, and I am grateful to them for what they have done for me. Some Members think they have not received consideration. Why not let the clerk give consideration and "check up noses," and see how many bills the Members have, and put some of them in the next bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I hope that any Member who feels that he has not been fairly treated will advise the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] has the floor.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I think he will yield to me the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER. You can not do that.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether his committee under any circumstances recommends pensions to soldiers who have not received an honorable discharge?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe that we in the past have reported out one bill that I recall where the soldier had two honorable discharges and one dishonorable discharge.

Mr. TILSON. Then, in other words, the gentleman's committee does sometimes give pensions where the Pension Office would hold that the service was not faithful; in other words, where the soldier has been separated from the service by means other than an honorable discharge?

Mr. ASHBROOK. In the case I refer to that undoubtedly is true. But the committee does not act favorably upon cases where the soldier is marked as a deserter on the roll. He must have an honorable discharge.

Mr. TILSON. As I understand it, it is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs—

Mr. ASHBROOK. No; the Committee on Invalid Pensions—

Mr. TILSON. No; the Committee on Military Affairs to pass upon the question as to whether he shall have an honorable discharge, to decide questions of this kind upon evidence submitted and upon the records of the War Department.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Of course, the gentleman understands that if a soldier secures an honorable discharge through the passage of a special bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs the soldier has a status on the rolls and gets a pension in the regular way.

Mr. TILSON. That is what I wished to bring out, whether the Committee on Invalid Pensions also considers such questions as the Committee on Military Affairs usually passes upon; that is, whether a man has proved by proper testimony that in equity he is entitled to an honorable discharge. If the gentleman's committee accepts evidence of that kind, it seems to me the jurisdiction of the two committees overlaps.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The Committee on Invalid Pensions has plenty of duties of its own to perform without encroaching on the rights or prerogatives of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I am sure our committee does not so encroach.

Mr. TILSON. I have no disposition to guard the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs in this class of cases, but am making the inquiry because it occurred to me that it might be easier to get a bill of this character through the Committee on Invalid Pensions than it is to get it through the Committee on Military Affairs, for I, like other Members, have plenty of cases of this kind coming from my own constituents.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I hope I have made satisfactory answer to the gentleman's inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The pro forma amendments are withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Clarinda Mahoney, widow of Patrick H. Mahoney, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment United Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles W. Mahoney, helpless and dependent child of said Patrick H. Mahoney, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Clarinda Mahoney, the name of said Charles W. Mahoney shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Clarinda Mahoney.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk calls the attention of the Chair to the fact that in line 24, on page 2, after the word "United," the word "States" should be inserted.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is correct, Mr. Speaker, and I offer that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Clarinda Brauch, widow of Levi Brauch, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, in the word "Brauch," which occurs twice in line 5, on page 20, I move to strike out the letter "u" and insert the letter "n," so as to make the word "Branch."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 5, strike out the letter "u" in the word "Brauch" and insert the letter "n."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Theodore Kiefer, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out lines 5 to 8, inclusive, on page 22.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, strike out lines 5 to 8, inclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. In the Record of to-day I find that the colloquy between Messrs. NORTON of North Dakota, FESS of Ohio, HEFLIN of Alabama, and RAGSDALE, as printed, does not show the colloquy as reported by the Official Reporters. I ask unanimous consent that the Record be amended by publishing in the Record the colloquy as reported by the Official Reporters, and by printing in parallel columns the colloquy as published, having been amended, and to show by whom amended.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina objects.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move—

Mr. GARRETT. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to propound a question to the gentleman from South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. GARRETT. I will withdraw that if the gentleman from South Carolina will yield the floor.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Invalid Pensions is entitled to the floor, and I ask that the Clerk proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. It seems to me this is not the proper time to bring up a matter of this kind, a correction of the Record.

Mr. KITCHIN and others. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not listen to half a dozen at once. Did the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. GARRETT. I did. I withdraw the point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws it. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] has not offered any resolution.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes; I move that the Record for January 25, 1917, be amended by printing the colloquy as reported between Messrs. NORTON of North Dakota, FESS of Ohio, HEFLIN of Alabama, and RAGSDALE in parallel columns, in one column printing the colloquies as reported by the Official Reporters of the House and in the parallel columns the colloquies as they appear in the Record, and that it show by whom corrected.

Mr. FERRIS. I make the point of order that that motion is not in order at this time, during the progress of the reading of a bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. This is not a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HEFLIN. I should like some time to be fixed when the gentleman from South Carolina and myself can be heard on this motion.

The SPEAKER. Both gentlemen now will keep still until the Chair can get this thing straightened out. The question is whether the matter that is offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is privileged. If the gentleman wants to be heard on that the Chair will hear him very briefly on the point of order.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the colloquy yesterday, statements were made therein that the applause that I received came from the Republican side. It appears that the official report of the stenographer carries applause for Mr. HEFLIN on the Republican side. The Record as it appears shows that this has been stricken out by some one, and it appears in the Record as applause on the Democratic side.

Mr. HEFLIN. All of which is susceptible of proof by Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] has the right to the floor. After this bill is disposed of the gentleman can rise to a question of privilege, if any he have.

Mr. ASHBROOK. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The Committee on Pensions has a bill—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio want the floor?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just decided that the gentleman is entitled to it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I ask that the clerk proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion by Mr. ASHBROOK, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PENSIONS (H. R. 20496).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 20496. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20496) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of William B. Yeater, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Silas H. Fish, late of Company D, Thirty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Howe, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susan Bertin, dependent mother of Frank B. Bertin, late of Casual Detachment, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William T. East, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Addison M. Zoll, late of Governor's Troop, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas M. Ranes, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jess Musgrave, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas W. Maples, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Will M. Lillard, late of Company G, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Constable, incompetent daughter of Jacob H. Constable, late of Company D, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, payments to be made to the duly appointed guardian.

The name of Charles D. Robertson, alias Charles D. Harris, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Black, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fred Craig, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Martin J. Healey, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William Matthews, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert T. Lucy, late of Company G, First Regiment South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Francis J. O'Hearn, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James J. Held, late of Company F, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Michael J. Walsh, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frederick G. Oldt, late of Battery E, First Regiment United States Light Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles F. Coss, late of Company M, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Hall, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jerome Wilsey, late of Companies E and C, Second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of George J. Krebs, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of William S. Tomey, late of Troop G, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Russell B. Tripp, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar K. Stinson, late of Sixty-fifth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hamilton Masse, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of James Park Harris, late of Battery G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edgar Abbott, late of Company L, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ella J. Hills, widow of Charles F. Hills, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said Charles F. Hills until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of John R. Bare, alias John R. Barrett, late of Company I, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George F. Randall, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Henry Fields, late of Company A, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Fetterman, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Garrison M. Wright, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of David W. Corson, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Homer E. Mills, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles B. Montgomery, late of Company C, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Claudia E. Geary, widow of Thomas W. Geary, late of United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward R. Turnbach, late of Governor's Troop, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$14 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James L. McPherson, late of U. S. S. *Boston*, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Michael Kilrow, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Jordan, late of Troop D, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles A. Galle, late of Troop E, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ulysses S. Hall, late of Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Boetticher, widow of Albert Boetticher, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William M. Noel, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fred J. Wagner, late of Battery G, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Bockheim, late of Company K, Thirty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph F. Kelly, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Lawrence Hubschman, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of William Lendemann, late of Troop I, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Schallert, late of Company A, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Delos M. Dodge, late first lieutenant of Company G, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of J. George Spettel, late of Company K, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles B. Boyd, late of Company D, Fiftieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milo D. Heath, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charlie Forbes, late of Troop E, Eleventh United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of Bruce Frantz, late of Company M, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jesse G. Lott, late of Company I, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John N. Jackson, late of Troop M, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Cocain, dependent mother of Charles E. Cocain, late of United States ship *Constellation*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Amelia Pagan de Rolfe, widow of Henry H. Rolfe, late of Second Battalion, Porto Rico Provisional Regiment Infantry,

Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the four minor children of the said Henry H. Rolfe until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of William T. Gies, late of Companies D and M, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harriet A. Pearman, widow of William E. Pearman, late hospital steward in the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ed Hastings, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John N. Jennings, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James C. Herrington, late of Company F, Fifty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Berton E. Archer, late of Company E, Third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Edward J. McCauley, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Dodder, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James O'Heron, late of Company G, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John C. Gaskins, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Dippie, late of Twenty-second Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura D. Bricker, dependent mother of William F. Bricker, late lieutenant commander United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Reuben D. Way, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James J. Scally, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allie M. Kirkwood, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace Keeter, late of Company B, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph L. Rollins, late of Company G, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward H. Osmond, late of Company C, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lynn J. Heldreth, late of the Ninety-fifth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Burke, dependent mother of Michael J. Burke, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Asa C. Wood, late of Company H, Second Battalion Engineers, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Reuben R. Vall, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel J. Keefe, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harry Kraft, late of Troops B and F, Eleventh Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of James E. Rath, late of Troop C, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Samuel A. Holt, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John P. Phillips, late of Capt. Isaac J. Carter's independent company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clark Brown, late of Company I, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Brother Bulk, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry O. Weckle, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Gifford Ramey, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Hosking, late of Company E, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jacob Bruno, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Keels, late of Anderson's battery, South Carolina Volunteer Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Robert Wilks, late of Company E, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leo V. Burchett, late of Company D, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Victor Lewis, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Wiley Lawson, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John W. Paulus, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fred W. Porter, late of Company H, First Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Jaynes, late of Troop E, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Bowen, late of Troop E, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Fried, dependent mother of the late Louis O. Fried, late of the U. S. S. Arkansas, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harry L. Relf, late of Company L, Second Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of David O. Thomas, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles E. Derr, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas S. Martin, late chief yeoman, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Al. A. Reineck, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Noland, widow of Thomas Noland, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month upon her furnishing the Bureau of Pensions with satisfactory evidence that she is the lawful widow of the said Thomas Noland.

The name of Eugene B. Richard, late of Troop E, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harry E. Bryan, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christian S. Lowe, late of Company L, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Marcel H. Poirier, late of Troop C, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Lowrey, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edgar M. Curtis, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Lee J. Cochran, late of Troop F, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Abrams, late of Troop C, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Florence E. Edinger, widow of Frederick Edinger, late of United States Marine Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of the said Frederick Edinger, Anna N. Edinger, until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Lyman Byers, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura E. Elliott, widow of Benjamin F. Elliott, late of Capt. M. M. Williams's Company D, Recruiting Battalion, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Marie Vigini, widow of Charles W. Vigini, late of Company M, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said Charles W. Vigini until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Jesse Walters, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis F. Moebus, late chief musician of Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank Clark, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George C. Sausser, late second lieutenant Company L, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hansford Austin, late of Company M, First Regiment Florida Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Killoren, late of Company I, Forty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Edward M. Walters, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Suhr, widow of Jacob Suhr, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a

pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Davison, widow of George Davison, late of Company I, United States Mounted Rifles, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Paralee Jackson, widow of William J. Jackson, recruit, unassigned, United States Army, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month upon her filing with the Pension Bureau satisfactory evidence to show she is the lawful widow of the said William J. Jackson.

The name of James M. Neighbors, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Polly Ann Bowman, widow of John Bowman, late of Capt. H. Garment's Company I, Georgia Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The names of George G. Hoffman, Werner L. Hoffman, and Josephine J. Hoffman, minor children of Werner L. Hoffman, late of United States Marine Corps, War with Spain, and pay them a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the three minor children of the said Werner L. Hoffman until they reach the age of 16 years. Payment to be made to duly appointed guardian.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 1238. William B. Yeater.	H. R. 13602. James C. Herrington.
H. R. 1398. Silas H. Fish.	H. R. 13633. Berton E. Archer.
H. R. 1476. Richard Howe.	H. R. 13741. Edward J. McCauley.
H. R. 1699. Susan Bertin.	H. R. 13746. John F. Dodder.
H. R. 1706. William T. East.	H. R. 14164. James O'Heron.
H. R. 1797. Addison M. Zoll.	H. R. 14205. John C. Gaskins.
H. R. 1829. Thomas M. Ranes.	H. R. 14312. Charles Dippie.
H. R. 2063. Jess Musgrave.	H. R. 14357. Laura D. Bricker.
H. R. 2355. Thomas W. Maples.	H. R. 14379. Reuben D. Way.
H. R. 2362. Will M. Lillard.	H. R. 14574. James J. Scally.
H. R. 2397. Mary E. Constable.	H. R. 14605. Allie M. Kirkwood.
H. R. 2621. Charles D. Robertson,	H. R. 14648. Horace Keeter.
alias Charles D. Har-	H. R. 14652. Joseph L. Rollins.
ris.	H. R. 14799. Edward H. Osmond.
H. R. 2680. Charles Black.	H. R. 14965. Lynn J. Heldreth.
H. R. 2759. Fred Craig.	H. R. 15011. Catherine Burke.
H. R. 3163. Martin J. Healey.	H. R. 15207. Asa C. Wood.
H. R. 3954. William Matthews.	H. R. 15247. Reuben R. Vail.
H. R. 4037. Robert T. Lucy.	H. R. 15267. Daniel J. Keefe.
H. R. 4522. Francis J. O'Hearn.	H. R. 15292. Harry Kraft.
H. R. 4958. James J. Held.	H. R. 15371. James E. Ratliff.
H. R. 5045. Michael J. Walsh.	H. R. 15413. Samuel A. Holt.
H. R. 5053. Frederick G. Oldt.	H. R. 15448. John P. Phillips.
H. R. 5142. Charles F. Coss.	H. R. 15520. Clark Brown.
H. R. 5323. William Hall.	H. R. 15556. Brother Buis.
H. R. 5394. Jerome Wilsey.	H. R. 15648. Henry O. Weckle.
H. R. 5954. George J. Krebs.	H. R. 15654. Gifford Ramey.
H. R. 5977. William S. Tomey.	H. R. 15751. Thomas Hosking.
H. R. 6202. Russell B. Tripp.	H. R. 15784. Jacob Bruno.
H. R. 6259. Oscar K. Stinson.	H. R. 15849. William E. Keels.
H. R. 6620. Hamilton Masse.	H. R. 15850. Robert Wilks.
H. R. 6937. James Park Harris.	H. R. 15901. Leo V. Burchett.
H. R. 7802. Edgar Abbott.	H. R. 15911. Victor Lewis.
H. R. 7832. Ella J. Hills.	H. R. 15920. Wiley Lawson.
H. R. 7877. John R. Bare, alias	H. R. 16072. John W. Paulus.
John R. Barrett.	H. R. 16106. Fred W. Porter.
H. R. 7945. George F. Randall.	H. R. 16200. John A. Jaynes.
H. R. 8298. Henry Fields.	H. R. 16292. William C. Bowen.
H. R. 8392. George W. Fetterman.	H. R. 16424. Mary Fried.
H. R. 8528. Garrison M. Wright.	H. R. 16497. Harry L. Relf.
H. R. 8972. David W. Corson.	H. R. 16513. David O. Thomas.
H. R. 9203. Homer E. Mills.	H. R. 16716. Charles E. Derr.
H. R. 9245. Charles B. Montgom-	H. R. 16804. Thomas S. Martin.
ery.	H. R. 17072. Al A. Reineck.
H. R. 9448. Claudia E. Geary.	H. R. 17363. Elizabeth Noland.
H. R. 9562. Edward R. Turnbach.	H. R. 17564. Eugene B. Richard.
H. R. 9778. James L. McPherson.	H. R. 17773. Harry E. Bryan.
H. R. 9860. Michael Kilrow.	H. R. 17775. Christian S. Lowe.
H. R. 10074. Henry Jordan.	H. R. 17913. Marcel H. Poirier.
H. R. 10355. Charles A. Galley.	H. R. 17972. John T. Lowrey.
H. R. 10620. Ulysses S. Hall.	H. R. 18030. Edgar M. Curtis.
H. R. 10725. Elizabeth Boettcher.	H. R. 18060. Lee J. Cochran.
H. R. 10748. William M. Noel.	H. R. 18109. William J. Abrams.
H. R. 10891. Fred J. Wagner.	H. R. 18113. Florence E. Edinger.
H. R. 10892. John A. Bockheim.	H. R. 18244. Lyman Byers.
H. R. 11105. Joseph F. Reilly.	H. R. 18258. Laura E. Elliott.
H. R. 11496. Lawrence Hubschman.	H. R. 18357. Marie Vignini.
H. R. 11568. William Lendemann.	H. R. 18368. Jesse Walters.
H. R. 11669. Frank Schallert.	H. R. 18416. Louis F. Moebus.
H. R. 11769. Delos M. Dodge.	H. R. 18422. Frank Clark.
H. R. 11888. J. George Spettell.	H. R. 18426. George C. Sausser.
H. R. 11903. Charles B. Boyd.	H. R. 18572. Hansford Austin.
H. R. 12085. Milo D. Heath.	H. R. 18644. William L. Killoren.
H. R. 12360. Charlie Forbes.	H. R. 18764. Edward M. Walters.
H. R. 12434. Bruce Frantz.	H. R. 19130. Mary Suhr.
H. R. 12659. Jesse G. Lott.	H. R. 19262. Elizabeth Davison.
H. R. 12834. John N. Jackson.	H. R. 19301. Paralee Jackson.
H. R. 12855. Catharine Cocain.	H. R. 19608. James M. Neighbors.
H. R. 12940. Amella Pagan	H. R. 19737. Polly Ann Bowman.
Rolfes.	H. R. 19975. George G. Hoffman,
H. R. 13053. William T. Gilles.	Werner L. Hoffman,
H. R. 13312. Harriet A. Pearman.	and Josephine J.
H. R. 13326. Ed Hastings.	Hoffman, minors.
H. R. 13433. John N. Jennings.	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William B. Yeater, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I rise for the purpose of getting some information as to the basis on which this claim was allowed. I have

some pension bills before this committee, and have had for the last two years. No one is more in favor of pensioning our soldiers and sailors who can show that they are entitled to a pension than I. But I do not think the committee ought to allow any claim unless there is some merit in it.

I have been examining the report of the committee and I find some that have less merit than those of my constituents. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill to state what are the grounds on which the claim is allowed for William B. Yeater.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the committee has submitted a report which contains all the evidence offered in this case. It would take some time to read that evidence, as it covers almost two pages of this printed report. I am not personally familiar with the record, but a cursory examination shows that the soldier served five years in the Regular Establishment. Affidavits have been submitted for the purpose of proving that the soldier's disabilities are attributable to service in the Army. At any rate, they were sufficient to convince the members of the subcommittee who considered the same, and the subcommittee made a report to the full committee, and the full committee accepted the report.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The War Department records show that the ailments from which the man was suffering when discharged were not received in line of duty.

Mr. KEATING. It shows that some ailments he contracted in the line of duty and some he did not.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. But nothing upon which he bases his claim for pension was received in line of duty.

Mr. KEATING. I have not read the entire report, but I think the gentleman is mistaken on that point.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Besides, this claimant owns a farm worth \$5,000 at the present time, and still the committee recommends that he receive a pension.

Mr. KEATING. The farm is one of those Missouri farms, and, while it is worth \$5,000, the income is only \$300. It is not a Minnesota farm nor a Colorado farm.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. That depends on how you work it. The land is better in Missouri than it is in Minnesota.

Mr. BORLAND. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. It all depends upon the amount of labor put on the farm. Mr. Speaker, I bring this to the attention of the Members to show the character of proof that is required by the Committee on Pensions before they will pass one of these bills. I believe the claim ought to be allowed, notwithstanding the War Department has found that on two occasions there was no evidence upon which to base a claim for a pension. Still this committee has taken other evidence that satisfies it that his case should receive some consideration. In the matter that I have in mind the facts will show this. The party enlisted in 1868 and served for three years in the Regular Establishment. During a part of that time, and especially the last winter, he was required to spend two or three months in the woods in northern Minnesota, where he had to sleep on the cold ground, from which exposure he contracted rheumatism, and his eyes became affected. He remained an invalid from the time he received his discharge to his death.

From the time he was discharged from the Army until the time he died, two or three years ago, he was always a sufferer from rheumatism and from an affliction of the eyes which the evidence shows was traceable to the exposure he underwent that winter. That is testified to by one of his comrades who was with him. That is testified to by a number of doctors, bringing it down to date. I say it occurs to me that that sort of a case is just as much, if not more, entitled to consideration than dozens of matters that are included in this bill.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Did the gentleman present that before the committee?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I have had it before the committee. I am not complaining that the committee has treated me differently from anyone else, but I think it is time that the House should know how these matters are being handled.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the subcommittee that reported this claim to the main committee. The subcommittee went into this case very carefully and made a favorable report to the main committee, and that report was sustained. This particular bill in question was introduced into the Congress by our honored Speaker, and I know that he would not introduce a bill asking for a pension unless it were meritorious. I do not think there is any ground for the criticism of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] against this particular bill. It is hard for the subcommittees or the main committee of the Committee on Pensions to make any hard and fast rule for the consideration of all claims. If there were a hard and fast rule, all claims could be settled by the Bureau of Pen-

sions; but there must be a flexibility in these matters, and we must determine them upon their individual merits. The purpose of the Committee on Pensions is to do equity where equity exists, and it does in this case. This committee went into this case very carefully and made its report. That report was unanimously adopted by the main committee, and it is presented here for your consideration. I trust it will be allowed to remain as it stands.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House for a few minutes upon this particular claim. If anyone ever deserved a pension, this man William B. Yeater, of Perry, Mo., does. I desire to refer now to what the committee found in respect to this bill (H. R. 1238):

H. R. 1238. William B. Yeater, Perry, Mo., served in the Regular Establishment in Company C, First United States Infantry, from June 6, 1891, to June 5, 1896, when honorably discharged.

Here is what that committee found was the matter with Mr. Yeater, and it is a wonder he did not die:

The records of the War Department show medical treatment in service for vaccinia, contusion of the right side of abdomen (strained and bruised while playing football), and tonsillitis, all in line of duty. Also, for acute inflammation of glands of left groin, nonvenereal, contracted in some way while absent on leave, and not held as due to line of duty.

Soldier filed a claim for pension in 1914, based upon rupture of right side and injury of left groin. The rupture was rejected on the ground of no record to show same incurred in service. The injury to left groin was rejected because the record of the War Department shows same was not due to line of duty.

Let us see what the witnesses say: Mr. C. G. Daniel, vice president of the Vandalia Banking Association, of Vandalia, Mo., one of the foremost citizens of the State, testifies that this man has a farm on which there is an incumbrance of \$3,800, and that he owes a personal obligation of \$300.

But they say that the income is \$300. Well, now, right in that particular region there is some land worth \$150 to \$200 an acre, whereas in the belt of hills it is worth very little. Everybody in that western country knows about these brakes. So far as the property is concerned, the man has none. Now, here is what Dr. Parrish, the oldest physician in this town, states:

The undersigned, J. C. Parrish, of Vandalia, Audrain County, Mo., upon oath, states: I have to-day examined Mr. William B. Yeater, formerly of Company C, First United States Infantry, stationed at Angel Island, Cal., in 1894. Mr. Yeater is suffering from a direct inguinal hernia of the right side, and is compelled to wear a truss constantly. He reports that this hernia appeared in 1894 while in the service, he thinks, as a result of hurdle jumping and other exercises provided for the service. On the left side the inguinal glands were removed at about that time, according to his statement, and the scars indicate that an extensive operation for removal of the inguinal glands was performed. The left hip since that time has given him more or less discomfort, and now he has a halting stride in walking.

Now, if men are being pensioned who get hurt in the Army, he is entitled to his pension, because he has not got enough property to live on. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Jess Musgrave, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, following line 2, add the name of Louisa Carey, widow of Joseph B. Crowley, late of Company B, Third Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, is this a committee amendment?

Mr. KEATING. No; it is not.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if I may be recognized—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to grant a pension to a remarried widow of the Mexican War. Under the law she is not entitled to a pension. It was probably the intention of the author of the Ashbrook bill to include remarried Mexican War widows in the bill which we passed at the last session, but they were not included. The Committee on Pensions has adopted a rule by which all such pension bills are rejected. Mr. Ashbrook's bill was rejected, as we have rejected bills of other Members of the House. I do not think I am revealing any secret of the committee when I say that that determination was reached by a majority vote. Some members of the committee, the minority of the committee, including the chairman of the committee, took the position Mr. ASHBROOK takes. The chairman of the committee [Mr. KEX of Ohio] is unable to be here to-day, and he has asked me to read in my time the fol-

lowing statement, which he prepared in reference to the amendment just offered by Mr. ASHBROOK. I will ask the Clerk to read the statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read Mr. KEX's statement in the time of the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

"I am not surprised that the gentleman has brought before the House and suggests the addition to the pending bill a provision for pensioning this remarried widow. I wish to state very briefly the facts in connection with the case. The Committee on Pensions, under Rule X, has always disposed of remarried-widow cases along the lines provided for in the general pension law of March 3, 1901, which required, first, that she should have been the wife of her soldier husband during some part of his service in a war; second, that she should show her dependent condition; and, third, that her subsequent marriage or marriages should have been dissolved without fault upon her part. On September 8, 1916, Congress approved what is known as the Ashbrook law, which the gentleman himself introduced. Under the second section of this law the first and second requirements of the former act relating to remarried widows was abolished as far as Civil War widows are concerned. In order to obtain a pension under the Ashbrook law a widow of a Civil War soldier who remarried has now only to show the death of her second husband, or that she was divorced from him without fault upon her part. This law relates entirely to Civil War widows, however; it does not extend this liberal provision to remarried widows of the Mexican War, any of the Indian wars, or the War of 1812, although all of these wars occurred prior to the Civil War. At a recent meeting of the Committee on Pensions I brought to the attention of the committee the case of the remarried Mexican War widow the gentleman refers to, together with that of a remarried widow of the War of 1812, and invited a full discussion as to whether we should adhere to our former practice in this class of cases or regard Congress, in the passage of the act of September 8, 1916, as intending to mean that the liberal provisions as to remarried widows in that law should apply to the widows of all wars prior to the Civil War. After a full discussion of the matter, the committee, by a majority vote, tabled both of these claims and passed a resolution instructing the examiner to prepare no more claims of a similar character. In event this item should be added to the bill, as the gentleman requests, I think the Committee on Pensions would construe such action as meaning that Congress does intend the liberal remarried-widow section of the Ashbrook law to apply to all war widows prior to the Civil War.

"I think that the Committee on Pensions by a two-thirds vote has waived its rule in recent Congresses and allowed by special act two remarried Mexican War widows, whose sad physical, mental, and financial condition caused them to believe such action was proper."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I will take up the time of the committee as briefly as possibly but I want to say that there is no doubt but what it was the intention, when the Ashbrook widows' pension law was passed, to put widows of the Mexican War upon the same status as widows of the Civil War. There is no doubt about that, and under section 1 of that law they are on the same basis or status as those of the Civil War, but in section 2, which relates to remarried widows, through an oversight in the Senate, where amendment was made, such Mexican War widows were not included. I want to say just one word about this case. By the way, this case is really one which belongs to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] who is now occupying the Speaker's chair.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Allow me to make this statement and then I will be glad to yield. Joseph D. Crowley, whom I am informed was a relative of a former Member of this body, enlisted in the Mexican War on June 1, 1846, and served 13 months when he received an honorable discharge. He incurred disabilities in the service but was never pensioned. In 1852 he was married to Louisa Williams, with whom he lived until his death five years later. Seven years after that time this widow was remarried to a man by the name of William Carey, with whom she lived until his death in 1913.

Now, this woman is 83 years old. She has no relatives in the world except a granddaughter, who, by the way, is a widow, and with whom she lives and makes her home, and who is compelled to work out for a living to support herself and this old grandmother, who has no property and no income and is helpless and unable to help herself in any way. It is clearly an act of justice and humanity to treat these old Mexican War widows, as there are only just a handful of them left, the same as we

treat the Civil War widows. And I trust that this amendment will pass. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes. I will probably not take the time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is very necessary, I will say to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] that certain resolutions be passed by this House as quickly as possible in order that they may be messaged to the Senate, and I trust we will not have a discussion of this matter here, because I have been patiently waiting here, as the gentleman knows, for quite a while. The other body may adjourn at any moment, and I am very anxious to have this resolution sent there before adjournment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to state that I am personally opposed to this amendment, and I hope it will not carry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KEATING. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 51, noes 18.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of David W. Corson, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the dollar sign will be placed before the figures "50," in line 15.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee how it is that a man gets a bill reported out of this committee, anyway?

Mr. KEATING. It is a very simple process, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENNET. I have not found it so.

Mr. KEATING. In all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, this committee can not be charged with displaying favoritism toward any Member of the House or toward either side of the House. The bills are reported out without regard to the identity of the Members or their political affiliations.

Mr. BENNET. That casts rather a doubt on the fact of whether I have any political affiliations, I am afraid. I have five bills in the committee, all of which I regard as meritorious, some more so than others. Before I left at the close of the long session I went to the clerk of the committee and called his attention to the fact that names commencing with "B" seemed to be neglected so far as the twenty-third district of New York was concerned, and he said he would have one of my bills written up. I went to him when I came back at the beginning of this session, and he said it would be attended to. I went to him a little later on, and he said the matter would receive attention when the first omnibus bill came up. I have read the list of names very carefully, and I do not find any of the names of the people attached to the bills I have introduced, and the process, so far as I am concerned, does not seem to be so simple.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it is a physical impossibility for the examiner of the committee to report out every case submitted to him.

Mr. BENNET. Ought not each Member to get at least one bill if he has a meritorious bill?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know that that would be a good rule.

Mr. BENNET. I am not saying it would.

Mr. KEATING. And I will say, in so far as the committee is concerned, it endeavors to distribute the bills among the different Members. A very conscientious effort is made along those lines without determining definitely whether a Member is entitled to one bill or two bills. But we do endeavor to see to it that each Member has a square deal.

Mr. BENNET. I have the case of a man who suffers from causes clearly due to Army service. For certain reasons he can not get a pension in the regular way. In other cases in former years I have been able to get pension bills where the cases were not more meritorious than this one.

Mr. KEATING. I suggest to the gentleman that he consult with his colleague from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR], and he will find out the way to proceed.

Mr. BENNET. Then, I feel I have not wasted the five minutes that I have occupied.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Catharine Cocain, dependent mother of Charles E. Cocain, late of U. S. S. *Constellation*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of 12 per month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the dollar sign will be placed before the figures "12" in line 17.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] a question in regard to the policy of the committee in granting, or rather not granting, pensions to widows of veterans of the Spanish War.

I understand that it is the policy of the committee not to pass any bills granting pensions to widows of veterans of the Spanish War, although I discover in looking over this bill and the report accompanying it that the committee has come dangerously near violating what I have been told was the policy of the committee, as will appear by reference to the report on H. R. 7822. The committee has perhaps saved itself from the charge of inconsistency in this respect in that case on account of the service of the soldier in the Regular Establishment for a few days.

I would like to ask if there is any prospect of the committee changing its policy so that the deserving widows of the veterans of the Spanish War will be able to get a pension before the passage of the Key bill, which is apparently tied up in the Senate?

Mr. KEATING. The committee takes the position that evidence must be submitted to show that the soldier died of disabilities incurred in the service. The widow must make a reasonable showing in that particular. Where the widow frankly admits that the soldier did not die of disabilities incurred in the service, then the committee will not recommend a pension; but where the widow makes a reasonable showing, a showing sufficient to convince the members of the committee, the committee will recommend the granting of a pension.

Mr. MAPES. Of course if the widow can make a showing that the soldier died because of disabilities incurred in the service, she is entitled to a pension through the Bureau of Pensions under the general law.

Mr. KEATING. In some cases it is much easier to convince a committee of Members of the House than it would be to convince the examiners of the Pension Bureau.

Mr. MAPES. I will say to the gentleman that I have had before the committee for two or three years bills to pension two widows, both of whom have children and no property whatever. One of them has three small children, and is trying the best she can to support herself and children by manual labor, working in a factory, the last I knew. The other is similarly situated. No more deserving cases could be imagined. I am told that the reason why the committee does not report these bills and others of a like nature is because it feels that by holding them up it can hasten the passage of the Key bill in the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Exactly.

Mr. MAPES. I do not think that this policy of the House committee will affect the Senate a particle, and it seems to me that there are no more meritorious cases coming before the committee than the cases of these widows with minor children, who are obliged to support themselves and children. It seems to me that the policy of the committee is working a great hardship to those widows.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. McARTHUR. Does not the gentleman think that every one of these cases that could be passed in the form of a special bill should await the passage of the Key bill through the Senate.

Mr. MAPES. I do not think so. I do not think we should await the passage of the Key bill any longer. I hope the committee will reconsider its action in this respect and report out these deserving bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws the pro forma amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Amelia Pagan de Rolfe, widow of Henry H. Rolfe, late of Second Battalion, Porto Rico Provisional Regiment Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of 12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the four minor children of the said Henry H. Rolfe until they reach the age of 16 years.

The SPEAKER. In line 21, page 11, before the figures "12" the dollar mark is left out. Without objection, it will be put in. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John W. Paulus, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out, in line 14, page 17, the figures "\$17" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$24."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 17, line 14, by striking out the figures "\$17" and inserting "\$24."

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I would be doing my duty to consent to this rate without some objection. It is too low. In the eight years that I have been a Member of this House I have never offered an amendment to a pension bill to increase the rate. This man Paulus spent two years in the Philippine Islands and contracted disease resulting in paralysis of the lower limbs. He received \$10 a month because of his service, and the disease contracted in the Philippines.

He served two years, and within a year after he came out of the service he became totally helpless, paralyzed in his lower limbs and seriously diseased in the stomach and bowels. The doctors at the Pension Office did not take that into account—the paralysis of the lower limbs—because they said there was no pathological relationship between disease of the stomach and the paralysis of the lower limbs; but I take it that this committee wants to do justice to this man instead of adhering too closely to a rigid rule. I have no criticism to make of the committee, but this man came home from the Philippines after two years of service completely disabled. He has an old mother, broken in health, who goes out and does most menial service by the day to support this son in his present physical condition.

After I found that this committee had given this man \$17 a month I could not imagine under what rule it had provided that amount. I want to ask this House whether it wants to say, by rejecting this amendment, that it wants to pay a man who is completely paralyzed and confined to his house only \$17 a month for going 7,000 miles from home and defending his country's flag for two years in the Philippines. That is the question involved in the rejection of this amendment.

The evidence that was had before the committee came from the best men in Columbia City, Ind., his home. One of them is the postmaster at Columbia City. Another man who testified, Mr. McLellan, is a member of the Federal Reserve Board and a man of high character. I know this case personally.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How much did the gentleman ask for in the committee?

Mr. CLINE. I do not remember what I asked for in the bill. I know the case is one of the greatest merit, and this House, which expects to do justice by the defenders of its flag, is not in a position to say that a man who goes to the Philippines and spends two years in that country, defending the flag, and coming home becomes absolutely helpless, ought to be satisfied with \$17 a month.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we may be permitted to conclude the consideration of this bill after the reading of the Journal to-morrow morning; and I do that for the purpose of giving the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, an opportunity to present to the House an important resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that this bill be pending to-morrow immediately after the reading of the Journal. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUSE OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. COOPER of Ohio] was called home suddenly by the death of a member of the family, and I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted to him for one week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that leave of absence for one week be granted to his

colleague [Mr. COOPER of Ohio] by reason of a death in the family. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE FINLEY.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to this House the death of Hon. DAVID EDWARD FINLEY, a Member of the House from South Carolina. Mr. FINLEY's death took place at 12.30 o'clock to-day in a sanitarium at Charlotte, N. C. I shall ask the House to set aside a date later when proper tribute may be paid to the character of the distinguished deceased. At this time I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 470.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. DAVID EDWARD FINLEY, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Speaker announced as the committee on the part of the House Messrs. LEVER, AIKEN, BYRNES of South Carolina, BAILEY, RAGSDALE, NICHOLS of South Carolina, MOON, LLOYD, BELL, COX, BLACKMON, GOODWIN of Arkansas, MANN, STEENERSON, MADDEN, KAHN, BRITT, and WASON.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House, Hon. CHAMP CLARK, may be added to this committee of Members delegated to attend the funeral.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that the Speaker's name be added to this list. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remaining resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 27, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of 55 leases granted by the Secretary of War during the calendar year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1989); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary channel leading into Carolina Beach Pier, Cape Fear River, in New Hanover County, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 1990); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Liberty, or Poulso, Bay, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 1991); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Ordnance Department for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1992); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$25,000,000 to enable the President, in consideration of the cession of the Danish West Indian Islands to the United States, to pay the Government of Denmark on or before April 17, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 1993); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20361) to prohibit the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1357), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 6704) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain land to school district No. 9, of Sanders County, Mont., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1358), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 6670) authorizing the State of Montana to select other lands in lieu of lands in section 16, township 2 north, range 30 east, within the limits of the Huntley irrigation project and the ceded portion of Crow Indian Reservation in said State, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1359), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19424) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition and sale of lands known as the Klamath River Indian Reservation," approved June 17, 1892 (27 Stat. L., 52, 53), reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1360), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20228) to renew patent No. 25909, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1361), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 40) to authorize agricultural entries on surplus coal lands in Indian reservations, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1363), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII:

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1878) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, reported the same with amendment accompanied by a report (No. 1362), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17122) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Johnson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 20534) granting the consent of Congress to Washington-Newport News Short Line, a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Potomac River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 20535) permitting the Conway County Bridge District to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Arkansas River, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 20536) to increase the efficiency of the United States Military and the United States Naval Academies, and to increase the number of graduates therefrom by the immediate establishment of a one-year united service school near Fort Crook or Bellevue, Nebr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 20537) authorizing the construction of a military road from Washington City, D. C., to the Government reservation at Winthrop, Md., and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 20538) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the acts of August 4, 1914, August 15, 1914, March 3, 1915, and September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20539) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the acts of August 4, 1914, August 15, 1914, March 3, 1915, and September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20540) to authorize national banking associations to establish branches; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINEY: Resolution (H. Res. 468) authorizing the Rivers and Harbors Committee to investigate impounding of water back of Keokuk Dam; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Resolution (H. Res. 469) for consideration of H. R. 20361 to prohibit the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 471) for the consideration of H. R. 20500; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDALL: Resolution (H. Res. 472) for the consideration of H. R. 18986; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIMS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 360) appropriating \$40,000 for the relief of flood sufferers in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 361) to amend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 20541) granting an increase of pension to Walter B. Kelley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20542) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. Needham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 20543) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Cothron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 20544) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Erdman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20545) granting a pension to Patrick F. Flannery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 20546) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 20547) granting a pension to Mary H. Anthony; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 20548) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Barkley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 20549) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant certain lands to the city of Butte, Mont., for public park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 20550) granting a pension to David H. Earl; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 20551) granting an increase of pension to William H. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 20552) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20553) granting an increase of pension to Wellsley Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 20554) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Routh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 20555) granting an increase of pension to George W. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20556) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. McLoskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 20557) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 20558) granting an increase of pension to Treflay Cayan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 20559) granting a pension to Edwina B. Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 20560) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 20561) granting a pension to Sarah J. Casler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 20562) for the relief of Albert C. Sappington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 20563) granting an increase of pension to Lucius A. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 20564) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Flannigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 20565) granting an increase of pension to Byron Truesdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20566) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20567) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Burrows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20568) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Herpin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 20569) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 20570) granting an increase of pension to James Mackall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 20571) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 20572) granting an increase of pension to John H. Nutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Protests of sundry individuals and firms of Cincinnati, Ohio, against excluding liquor advertisements from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protests of sundry individuals and firms of Cincinnati, Ohio, against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Ralph Curry O'Kane, of Cincinnati, Ohio, for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, protest of sundry residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Socialist Party of Altoona, Pa., by P. M. Swanger, president, and Isaac Jones, secretary, mail-exclusion bills, House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Warren S. Blauvelt, Benjamin C. Comfort, T. C. Eayrs, M. Reed, George H. Bancroft, H. W. Stuffs, S. R. Tymstra, J. H. Fige, J. J. Krauss, J. H. Gilhooly, W. S. Cragg, G. D. Douglas, H. J. Zmit, and Charles W. Smith, all of Detroit, Mich., for the passage of House bill 13281, to promote better trade relations with Latin America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of William F. Bornhorst, president, St. Helena Chamber of Commerce, and 38 other citizens of Napa County, Cal., protesting against the passage of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Henry P. Richardson, superintendent house of detention for children, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring probation officer in connection with Federal Courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of State Probation Commission of New York, Homer Folks, president, favoring probation officer for Federal district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of National Model License League, opposing prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of 5 citizens of Moorestown, N. J., favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Mary E. Izard, favoring national woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Harry A. Van Gilder, favoring legislation for protection for migratory game birds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of R. Herbert Crowell, favoring national woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Sunday School at Musselshell, Mont., representing 100 persons, and Methodist Episcopal Church of Valier, Mont., favoring prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARR: Memorial of the commander and other members of the United Spanish War Veterans, favoring an increase of pay to clerks in the Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. A. Eldridge, W. E. Lord, and other members of Division 276, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Scranton, Pa., against the adoption of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Stewart Warring, president of the board of education of Evanston, Ill., favoring the Smith-Hughes vocational-education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Gustave K. Carns, of La Salle, Ill., for a resolution warning American citizens from taking passage on belligerent ships; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Model License League, against prohibition for the District of Columbia, except by vote of the people of the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Real Estate Exchange, favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Protests against the passage of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of M. J. Whittall, of Worcester, Mass., and various other manufacturers of Massachusetts, against the proposed increase in the tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Departure Manufacturing Co., of Bristol, Conn., and other manufacturing concerns, protesting against the proposed tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HART: Petition of Hackensack (N. J.) business and professional men, favoring an appropriation for field service for training alien population of the United States for citizenship; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Junior Order of American Mechanics, of Hackensack, N. J., favoring an appropriation for field service for training alien population of the United States for citizenship; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of citizens of Kaukana, Wis., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Townsend Grace Co., H. L. Gartner Marble Co., Brigham Hopkins Co., and Hilgartner Marble Co., of Baltimore, Md., opposing new revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Edwin Warfield, president of Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Baltimore, asking support of Hitchcock-Flood bill to give effect to treaty with Canada for protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Alma Manufacturing Co., Maryland Casualty Co., and Swindell Bros., druggists, all of Baltimore, Md., opposing certain provisions of the proposed new revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of District Lodge, No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., favoring the retaining in the fortifications appropriation bill of the proviso against the Taylor system of so-called scientific management; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 11, of the National Brotherhood of Potters; Cook-Kries & Co.; and the John B. Adt Co., all of Baltimore, Md., opposing the Bankhead bill and the Randall bill, House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of William O'Neill, Baltimore, Md., opposing universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition signed by 336 citizens of the city of Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Oil Well Supply Co., Pittsburgh Valve Foundry & Construction Co., and Pittsburgh Dry Goods

Co., with reference to excise tax on net income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORTH: Petitions of Dayton Methodist Episcopal Church, representing 350 people; Milton Methodist Episcopal Church, representing 100 people; Smicksburg Methodist Episcopal Church, representing 250 people; Pine Flats Christian Church, representing 60 people; the United Presbyterian Church of Dayton; the United Evangelical Church of Coolspring; Dayton Woman's Christian Temperance Union, representing 58 people; Summerville Woman's Christian Temperance Union, representing 15 people; Dayton Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, representing 380 people; Dayton Epworth League, representing 50 people; Young People's Society of the United Presbyterian Church; and 128 voters of Dayton, all in the State of Pennsylvania, for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition by the citizens of Berlin, opposing prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: Petition of voters of Auglaize County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Sheppard bill and others; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of Methodist Protestant Church, Shiloh Colored Baptist Church, Friends' Church, Sunday School Association, Baptist Ladies' Aid, Leonardo Baptist Church young people, all of Monmouth County, N. J., favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition from residents of the fifth district of Wisconsin, protesting against the passage of the District of Columbia and national prohibition measures, as well as the mail-exclusion bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of the Rhode Island Mothers' Congress, indorsing the bill to establish a woman's division in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Society of Colonial Dames in Rhode Island, regarding the deportation of Belgian workingmen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of H. Augustus Kendall, of Providence, R. I., chairman of the executive committee Rhode Island Life Underwriters' Association, favoring the bill to incorporate the National Association of Life Underwriters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the extension industrial secretary, Young Women's Christian Association, of Rhode Island, favoring the Casey bill to establish a woman's division in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of David J. White, president of Rhode Island Underwriters' Association, favoring the bill to incorporate the National Association of Life Underwriters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by Nelson Street in behalf of the town criers of Rhode Island, opposing the passage of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Bristol Division, No. 107, Sons of Temperance, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Bristol, Pa., praying for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.